John Adams
Library.

IN THE CUSTODY OF THE
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY.

SHELF No.
ADAMS
953.2

Holcombs Lib. Town of Li
1822

Dr. Chauncy's

ANSWER

To Dr. CHANDLER'S

APPEAL to the PUBLIC.

THE

APPEAL

TO THE

PUBLIC ANSWERED,

In Behalf of the NON-EPISCOPAL

CHURCHES in AMERICA;

CONTAINING

REMARKS on what Dr. THOMAS BRADBURY CHANDLER has advanced, on the four following Points.

The Original and Nature of the EPISCOPAL OFFICE;
Reasons for sending BISHOPS to AMERICA.
The PLAN on which it is proposed to send them.
And the OBJECTIONS against sending them obviated and refuted.

WHEREIN THE

REASONS for an AMERICAN EPISCOPATE are shewn to be insufficient, and the OBJECTIONS against it in full Force.

By CHARLES CHAUNCY, D. D.
And Pastor of the first Church of Christ in *Boston*.

BOSTON: N. E.
Printed by KNEELAND and ADAMS, in *Milk-Street*, for THOMAS LEVERETT, in *Corn-Hill*. 1768.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Author of the following work cannot say, that he undertook it in virtue of any "voted appointment," by a "convention of the Clergy"; or that he was "assisted" in it, either as to "method", or "management", by "directions" from so learned and able a body of men. He does not pretend to have been favoured with such distinguishing advantages. Not that his appearing, upon this occasion, was of his own meer motion. He would rather have chosen to have been excused from engaging in an affair, that he knew would be attended with labour, and might expose him to much ill-will. But he was, at length, overcome by private friends: More especially as urging this motive, its being published to the world, that, if no "objections were offered against an AMERICAN EPISCOPATE, *it would be taken for granted* ALL PARTIES WERE SATISFIED".

INTRODUCTION.

IT has, for ſome time, been known, that the Epiſcopal Clergy, in the Colonies, in conſequence of conſultations, in convened bodies, have tranſmitted a number of addreſſes to England; one, to his preſent Majeſty, importunately requeſting an AMERICAN EPISCOPATE; others, to the Arch-Biſhops of Canterbury and York, to the Biſhop of London, and to the Univerſities of Oxford, and Cambridge, ſolliciting their influence in an affair of ſuch importance to the well-being, if not the very being, of the Church of England in theſe parts of the world. If this was "never intended to be kept a ſecret", it was certainly made one, at leaſt in regard of the arguments made uſe of in ſupport of the thing requeſted; for though an authentic knowledge of them was deſired, it could not be obtained at firſt, and I know not that it ever has been ſince. The affair ſeems to have been carried on, as it were, under ground, until "the diſcovery of a favorable diſpoſition in many," at home, towards the ſupport of the thing in view. And now, the way being prepared, it is "thought proper, in a public manner, to give information of the REASONS, why an American-Epiſcopate is ſo earneſtly deſired by the Clergy, and other friends and members of the church". It might have been as proper, and certainly would have been more candid and generous, not to ſay fair, if they had given theſe reaſons, when they ſent their addreſſes ſupported by them. We might then have been heard at home as well, and

as

as ſoon, as they; and judgment might have been made upon an impartial hearing of the caſe, and not by hearing one ſide only. We are, after ſuch previous care to ripen matters at home in their favor, without all controverſie, under diſadvantage in offering what we have to ſay upon this affair, which may far more nearly concern the civil as well as religious intereſts of the Continent, than ſome may be ready, at firſt view, to imagine.

It muſt not be eſteemed ſtrange, if "ſome perſons", I may rather ſay many, are "alarmed at this conduct of the clergy". For now "the caſe has been explained", and is well "underſtood", there ſtill "remains uneaſineſs"; nor is the exhibited PLAN "ſo reaſonable", even in regard of the Epiſcopal churches; or ſo "harmleſs to other denominations", as the Dr. would repreſent. He hopes, "every objection", or even "ſuſpicion", will be "intirely obviated" by what he has to ſay. But "ſhould any objections continue, which ſhall be thought worthy of notice, objectors are invited to propoſe them in ſuch a manner, that they may be fairly and candidly debated before the tribunal of the public". It is in compliance with this invitation, that the following ſheets are wrote; as alſo, that it might not be "taken for granted, that all parties acquieſce and are ſatisfied". We join with the Epiſcopalians in bringing the caſe to open tryal. We deſire nothing more than an impartial hearing. Let the public judge between us.

I SHALL proceed in the method the Dr. has pointed out; taking into conſideration his ſeveral ſections one by one, and ſaying what may be thought proper, in a way of anſwer, to each of them diſtinctly.

THE

The Appeal to the Public anſwered.

Anſwer to Section I. which contains "a Sketch of the Arguments in favor of Epiſcopacy."

THE Dr. begins the ſubject before him with premiſing, "that the Church of England is Epiſcopal, and conſequently holds the neceſſity of Biſhops to govern the Church, and to confer eccleſiaſtical powers". If he means, that the conſtitution of the Church of England, as eſtabliſhed by law, is Epiſcopal, making Biſhops, under the King, and within certain preſcribed limits, the governors of the Church, and conveyers of eccleſiaſtical powers, and that this is the doctrine of the Church, it is readily acknowledged: But, if he intended to lead us into this thought, that the Church of England holds, or is obliged to hold, the DIVINE RIGHT of Biſhops to govern the Church, or confer eccleſiaſtical powers, in virtue of their being officers diſtinct from, and ſuperior to Preſbyters; we differ from him in opinion.

None

None of her public offices, no part of the ſyſtem of her conduct towards the clergy is founded on this principle. The paſſage he has here quoted, from the preface to the book of ordination, may ſeem to have an aſpect this way; but it is, as the late learned and excellent profeſſor *Wiggleſworth*, obſerves,* "too ſlender a foundation to build upon in the preſent caſe; eſpecially, if it be remembered, who were the compilers of that book, and what reaſon we have to conclude they were of the judgment, that *Prieſts and Biſhops are by God's law one and the ſame*". This was certainly the doctrine of the Church of England in the beginning of the reformation, and of the generality of its pious and learned divines for a very conſiderable time afterwards†.

In Henry the eight's time, the Arch-Biſhops, Biſhops, Arch-Deacons, and Clergy of England, in their book intituled, "the inſtruction of a chriſtian-man," ſubſcribed with all their hands, and dedicated to the King, Anno. 1537; and King Henry himſelf, in his book ſtiled, "a neceſſary erudition for any chriſtian-man," ſet out by the authority of the ſtatute of 32. Henry VIII. chap. 26. approved by both houſes of Parliament, prefaced with the King's own epiſtle, and publiſhed by his command Anno. 1543, expreſly reſolve, "that Prieſts and Biſhops BY GOD'S LAW, are one and the ſame; and that the power of ORDINATION and excommunication belongs EQUALLY to them both.‡

EDWARD

* Sober Remarks, pag. 11.

† See the many quotations from their writings to this purpoſe, by the celebrated Dr. Stillingfleet, in his Irenicum, pag. 394. and onwards.

‡ Calamy's defence of mod. non-conformity, pag. 91.

EDWARD the sixth no sooner came to the throne, than he took proper methods to go on with the reformation, begun in the former reign. Among other measures, he called an assembly of select Divines, the most respectable for station, piety and learning in that day, and proposed to them several questions, relative to the settlement of religion according to God's word; to which questions they gave in severally their resolutions in papers, all whose judgments were accurately summed up, and set down by the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury himself. In answer to the 10th question, "whether Bishops or Priests were first", Arch-Bishop Cranmer's opinion, given in writing under his own hand, was this, "Bishops and Priests were at one time, and were not two things, but one office in the beginning of Christ's religion". * The Bishop of Asaph, Dr. Therleby, Dr. Redmayn, and Cox, were all of the same opinion with the Arch-Bishop; and the two latter expressly cited the opinion of Jerom with approbation. † In this same reign, in a public declaration, subscribed by the Arch-Bishops of Canterbury and York, eleven Bishops, and many other Doctors and Civilians, it is expressly asserted, "that, in the new-testament, no mention is made of any degrees, or distinction of orders, but only of Deacons or ministers, and of Priests or Bishops". ‡ It is indeed beyond all reasonable dispute, that the Episcopal form of government was settled, at the reformation, as Dr. Stillingfleet expresses it, § "not under pretence of DIVINE RIGHT, but for the conveniency of that form to the state and condition of the Church at the time

* Irenicum pag. 392. † Ibid. pag. 393.
‡ Bishop Burnet's hist. of the reformation, and Neal's hist. of Puritanism. § Iren. pag. 385.

of its reformation". And it is in fact true, that, both in Henry the eighth's time, and in Edward the ſixth's, the Biſhops "took out commiſſions from the Crown * like other STATE OFFICERS, for the exerciſing their ſpiritual juriſdiction; in which they acknowledge, that ALL SORTS of juriſdiction, eccleſiaſtical as well as civil, flow ORIGINALLY from the Regal power, as from a SUPREME HEAD, † the fountain and ſpring of ALL

* The reſcript of Edward the 6th, cited by Sanders, runs thus, "To Thomas, Arch-Biſhop of Canter-"bury—Since from the King all power and juriſdicti-"on proceed,—we give thee power, within thy Dio-"ceſs, to give orders—by theſe preſents to endure at "our pleaſure". Dr. Layton's appeal to the Parliament againſt Prelacy, pag. 16. This ſame writer adds, "In the 1ſt year of the ſaid Edward 6th, it is enacted, that they ſhould exerciſe no juriſdiction in their Dioceſſes, nor ſend out writs, but in the King's name, and under his ſeal; which ſtatute was abrogated in the 1ſt of Q. Mary, and re-eſtabliſhed by Q. Elizabeth, and in the firſt of King James".

† Agreable to this is Arch-Biſhop Cranmer's anſwer to the 9th of King Edward's queſtions, which is thus expreſſed, "All chriſtian Princes have committed unto them immediately of God the whole care of all their ſubjects, as well concerning the adminiſtration of the word for the care of ſoul, as concerning the miniſtration of things political, and civil governance. And in both theſe adminiſtrations, they muſt have ſundry miniſters under them to ſupply that which is appointed to their ſeveral offices. The civil miniſters, under the King's Majeſty, in this realm of England, be thoſe whom it ſhall pleaſe his Highneſs, for the time, to put in authority under him; as for example, the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Treaſurer", &c. The miniſters of God's word under his Majeſty be the Biſhops, Parſons, Vicars, and ſuch other Prieſts as be appointed by his

ALL Magiſtracy within this kingdom; and that they ought, with grateful minds, to acknowledge this favor derived from the King's liberality and indulgence; and accordingly, they ought to render it up whenever the King thought fit to require it of them. And among the particulars of eccleſiaſtical power given them by this commiſſion, is that of ORDAINING Preſbyters; and all this to laſt no longer than the King's pleaſure". * Even in the days of Queen Elizabeth, when there was a re-eſtabliſhment of Church-government, after the fiery reign of Queen Mary, in the articles of religion agreed upon, the Engliſh form of Church-government was only determined to be "agreable to God's word", which, as Biſhop Stillingfleet ſays, "had been a very low and diminiſhing expreſſion, had they looked on it as abſolutely preſcribed in ſcripture, as the only neceſſary form to be obſerved in the Church". Nay, as this ſame writer obſerves, † if we come lower to the time of King

 James,

his Highneſs to that miniſtration; as for example, the Biſhop of Canterbury, the Biſhop of Dureſm, the Biſhop of Wincheſter, and the Parſon of Wynwick. All the ſaid officers and miniſters, as well of the one ſort as the other, be appointed, aſſigned, and elected in every place by the laws and orders of Kings and Princes". This ſame Arch-Biſhop, in anſwer to the King's eleventh queſtion, ſays, "A Biſhop may make a Prieſt by the ſcriptures, and ſo may Princes and Governors alſo, and that by the authority of God committed to them; and the people alſo by their election. For as we read that Biſhops have done it, ſo chriſtian Emperors and Princes uſually have done it. And the people, before chriſtian Princes were, commonly did elect their Biſhops and Prieſts". Irenicum pag. 391.

* Rights of the chriſtian Church, pref. pag. 29. as cited by the Diſſent. Gentleman's anſwer to White, pag. 202.

† Irenicum, pag. 394.

James, his Majeſty himſelf declared it in print, as his judgment, " that the civil power, in any nation, hath the right of preſcribing what external form of Church-government it pleaſes, which doth moſt agree to the civil form of government in the ſtate". *

THE plain truth is, this notion of the right of Biſhops to govern and ordain, as being officers in the Church, ſuperior to Preſbyters by DIVINE APPOINTMENT, was, as the excellent Mr. J. Owen ſays, " firſt promoted in the Church of England by Arch-Biſhop Laud. Dr. Holland, the King's profeſſor in Oxon, was much offended with him for aſſerting it in a diſputation for his degrees. He checked him publicly, and told him he went about

* So far from the beginning of the reformation as 1722, the lower houſe of convocation addreſſed the upper, ſignifying their trouble to find themſelves aſperſed, as ill affected to the Metropolitical and Epiſcopal rights, begging their Lordſhips would not give credit to any ſuch evil ſuggeſtions, as alſo that the *declaration* they had made and ſigned might be entered on their books. The import of this declaration was, " that whereas they had been ſcandalouſly repreſented as favorers of Preſbytery, in oppoſition to Epiſcopacy, they now declared, that they acknowledged the ORDER of Biſhops, as SUPERIOR to Preſbyters, to be of DIVINE APOSTOLICAL INSTITUTION".——

The ſame day they preſented an additional addreſs, ſignifying, that whereas this their declaration had given NEW OFFENCE, and that from having been traduced for allowing TOO LITTLE to Epiſcopacy, they were now accuſed of ASCRIBING TOO MUCH to it, they begged therefore that their Lordſhips would take the doctrine aforeſaid into their mature conſideration.—Calamy's abridgment, pag. 667, 668.

about to make a diviſion between the Engliſh, and other reformed Churches". *

It may have been the practice of the Church of England, for ſome time, as the Dr. obſerves, "to admit none to officiate as Clergymen, who have not been ordained by Biſhops". But it was not always ſo. The point of re-ordination did not begin to be urged, until the days of Arch-Biſhop Laud. Through his influence, as Mr. Prin tells us,† Biſhop Hall re-ordained Mr. John Dury, a miniſter of the reformed Church. But the old Church of England did not require, or practiſe re-ordination. In King Edward the ſixth's time, Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer, and P. Fagius, had eccleſiaſtical preferments in the eſtabliſhed Church without it. ‡ Mr. William Whitingham was made Dean of Durham, about 1563; though ordained by Preſbyters only. § In like manner, Mr. Travers, ordained by a Preſbyter beyond ſea, was ſeven years Lecturer at the Temple, and had the Biſhop of London's letter for it. ‖ And, even in the reign of King James the firſt, the validity of ordination by Preſbyters was not ſet aſide; as appears from the caſe of the three Preſbyters that were conſecrated Biſhops for Scotland, at London. ¶

The

* Plea for ſcripture ordination, pag. 115. † Owen's plea for ſcrip. ordination, pag. 117. ‡ Ibid. p. 118. § Ibid. p. 121. ‖ Ibid. p. 122.

¶ See the caſe related at large in Pierce's Vind. of Diſſent. pag. 167. He likewiſe here tells us, when the Arch-Biſhop of Spalato was in England, he deſired Biſhop Morton to re-ordain a perſon ordained beyond ſea, that he might be more capable of preferment. The Biſhop wrote him in anſwer, that it could not be done but to the ſcandal of the reformed Churches, wherein he would have no hand.

The Dr. having premiſed, that the Church of England holds the neceſſity of Biſhops to govern the Church, and confer orders, ſays, "it is not neceſſary to enter upon a particular defence of this doctrine, ſince the plea", in the preſent undertaking, "is equally valid, whether theſe principles are founded rightly or wrongly". Why then did he put himſelf to the trouble of exhibiting "a ſketch of the arguments, whereby the neceſſity of Epiſcopal government is defended"? I know of no valuable end this was adapted to anſwer. It may have increaſed the number of his pages; but, at the ſame time, it has detained his readers from attending to the main buſineſs in hand, and needleſly too, as I imagine; ſince he has given us only a detail of arguments that have been repeated over and over again, and as repeatedly been anſwered. However, he has made it proper, if not neceſſary, to poſtpone the conſideration of the grand point in view, until I alſo have given "a ſketch of the arguments" that have been uſed on the other ſide of the queſtion.

He ſays, "it is an eſſential doctrine of the Church of England, that none have any authority in the chriſtian Church, but thoſe who derive it from Chriſt, either *mediately* or *immediately*". This is not a doctrine peculiar to the Engliſh Church. Every other chriſtian Church, of whatever denomination, holds the ſame. The Churches, in the Colonies, are certainly of this opinion. But we differ from the Dr. when he ſays, "that this authority muſt be derived, if *mediately*, by a regular ſucceſſion", meaning hereby an uninterrupted one, in a line of Biſhops, as an order ſuperior to Preſbyters, even from the Apoſtles: Nor can we be brought

brought to think, that the uninterruption of this line of ſucceſſion is so NECESSARY, that, "if it be ONCE broken, and the power of ordination [that is, the power in this way communicated] loſt, not all the men on earth, not all the angels of heaven, without an immediate commiſſion from Chriſt, can reſtore it". Is this the doctrine of the Church of England? I am bold to ſay, no ſuch thing can be found in the thirty-nine articles, or in the homilies, or in the form of ordination, or in the common-prayer-book, or in any part of the Church's ſyſtem in regard of the Clergy: Nor is it eaſily ſuppoſeable, that one in an hundred, even of thoſe who are thorow Epiſcopalians, make this the object of their faith. It is indeed ſcarce credible, that any who have read the ſcriptures, which every where ſo expreſly ſecure the great bleſſings purchaſed by Chriſt to all that believe in him, repent, & ſincerely obey him, ſhould imagine notwithſtanding, that all who have a right to theſe bleſſings muſt be alſo members of a particular Church, over which an officer ſuperior to Preſbyters preſides, and in an uninterrupted ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles; eſpecially, when this pretended regular ſucceſſion is ſo far from being inconteſtable, that it is not capable of good proof, nor is there any probability, that ſo long a chain, running through ſo many ages of ignorance, violence, and all kinds of impoſture, has never once been broken. * To make

* The reader may ſee this matter ſet in its proper light by Biſhop Stillingfleet, in his Irenicum; by Profeſſor Jameſon, in his fundamentals of the Heirarchy examined; and, above all, by Mr. Thomas Walter, one of the firſt gentlemen for genius and learning this Country has produced, in his anſwer to a piece publiſhed

make the very being of a Church, and all covenant hopes of ſalvation to reſt upon ſo precarious a foundation, is, in reality of ſenſe, to expoſe the Church and religion of Jeſus Chriſt to open ridicule.—It will alſo follow from hence, that all the public worſhip of the Coloniſts, that are not Epiſcopalians, of all the diſſenters in England and Ireland, of the Church of Scotland, and of all the reformed proteſtant Churches abroad, whoſe miniſters were ordained by "the laying on of the hands of the Preſbytery" only, is a vile affront and abomination to Chriſt the head of his Church. So very charitable is this doctrine of the Dr. Inſtead of deſerving a ſerious confutation, it may reaſonably excite the contempt of all, who are acquainted with the genius and ſpirit of true chriſtianity.—It will farther follow from this doctrine, that, if the popiſh Biſhops, at the reformation, had ſtuck to their old principles, and diſcontinued the *ſucceſſion* of the miniſtry by refuſing to conſecrate, or to ordain, any but thoſe of their own communion, it had then been the duty of the Proteſtant laity

liſhed here in defence of Epiſcopacy, upon the plan of an uninterrupted ſucceſſion. Perhaps, the ſubject was never handled in a more maſterly and thorow manner. No attempt has been made, by way of reply, though he wrote forty years ago. Mr. Petoy the Hiſtorian ſays, that the Church of England, as well as the Scotch Church, was at firſt planted and governed without Biſhops, until Biſhops were ſent them from Rome. And there cannot be any good evidence produced, that there were any Biſhops in England, until Auſtin the Monk was ſent from Rome. He was made Biſhop of Canterbury, ſays Hoffman, about the year of Chriſt, 596. It will, perhaps, be found difficult to make out the ſucceſſion from him. No man alive can do it from the Apoſtles in an uninterrupted line.

laity to "forſake the aſſembling themſelves together", and all ſucceeding generations muſt have been content without the public worſhip and ordinances of God, until a new commiſſion was ſent down from heaven, giving power to ſome new apoſtles to adminiſter them, and to tranſmit again the ſame office to their ſucceſſors. The Dr. according to his principles muſt affirm all this; and yet, I believe, he will not be very free openly and explicitly to do it.—But the worſt of this doctrine of an uninterrupted ſucceſſion is ſtill behind; for it is derived through the BISHOPS OF ROME, who for an hundred years together, as Baronius himſelf acknowledges, * namely from the year nine hundred, to the year one thouſand, were "monſters for ignorance, luſt, pride and luxury". I cannot ſo well expreſs myſelf here, as in the words of one of the beſt writers upon the ſubject in controverſie; ſays he, in one of his letters to Mr. White, † "Theſe very orders, in which you glory, you "acknowledge to have derived ONLY from the "Church of ROME; *a Church*, which yourſelves, "in your homilies, confeſs to be *idolatrous* and "*antichriſtian*"; "not only a HARLOT, as the "ſcripture calleth her, but alſo a foul, filthy, old, "withered HARLOT; the *fouleſt* and *filthieſt* that "was ever ſeen.—And that, as it at preſent is, "and hath been for nine hundred years, it is ſo "far from the nature of the TRUE CHURCH, that "nothing can be more". Note, theſe homilies "every Clergyman publicly declares and ſubſcribes "with his hand, that they contain *a godly and* "*wholſome doctrine*, fit to be read in Churches by

 "miniſters".

* A. D. 912.—5. 8.

† Diſſent. Gentleman's anſwer, pag. 92, 93.

" miniſters. Now it is ONLY, Sir, from this *filthy*, " *withered*, *old HARLOT*, that you derive by or- " dination your *ſpiritual deſcent*. You confeſs your " ſelves *born of her*, as to *eccleſiaſtical pedigree* : And " *the ſons* of this fouleſt and filthieſt of harlots, " you acknowledge as *brethren*, by admitting *their* " *orders* as regular and valid ; whereas thoſe of " the *Proteſtant Church* you reject. If a *Prieſt*, " ordained with all the ſuperſtitious and idolatrous " rites of this *antichriſtian* and *falſe* Church, comes " over to the Church of England, you admit him " as a BROTHER *duly ordained*, without obliging " him to paſs under that ceremony again : But " if a miniſter of the *reformed Church* joins himſelf " to you, you conſider him as but a *Layman*, an " *unordained perſon*, and oblige him to receive *or-* " *ders* according to your form. How, Sir, is it " poſſible to account for this procedure ? Can *that* " *Church*, which is NO TRUE CHURCH, impart " *valid* and *true* orders ? Can a *filthy old harlot* " produce any other than a *ſpurious* and *corrupt* " breed ? Will you reſt the *validity* and *regularity* " of your miniſtrations on your receiving the *ſa-* " *cerdotal character* from the Biſhops and Popes of " the *Romiſh Church ?* Many, if not moſt, of " whom, were men of moſt corrupt and infamous " lives ; men, who were ſo far from being *regular* " and *valid* MINISTERS in the Church of JESUS " CHRIST, that they were not ſo much as *regular* " or *real* MEMBERS of it at all ; and therefore " could not poſſibly, *duly* or *regularly*, OFFICIATE " therein ; conſequently, had no power to com- " municate or convey *orders* or *offices* in the CHRI- " STIAN Church. Whatever *offices* therefore they " conveyed, are at beſt doubtful and ſuſpicious ; " if not abſolutely null, irregular, and void. So

" that

" that your own orders, if ſtrictly examined, may " miniſter great doubt & diſquietude of mind". — I ſhall only ſay farther, upon this article of ſucceſſion, ſuppoſing it was true, which is by no means allowed, that " objectors could not prove it has been interrupted", this is far from being ſufficient, in a matter of ſuch ESSENTIAL importance, as the Dr. makes the ſucceſſion to be. Was I in his way of thinking, I ſhould not, I freely own, dare officiate as an officer in the kingdom of Chriſt, unleſs I was able to ſatisfie myſelf, upon poſitive evidence, clear and indubitable, that the Biſhop, from whom I had received orders, derived his power to confer them on me in an uninterrupted line from the Apoſtles : Nor ſhould I believe, that the people of my charge acted a wiſe and ſafe part, unleſs they alſo, upon like evidence, were fully convinced, that I had, in this way, received my commiſſion from Chriſt. It is my firm perſuaſion, the Dr. would never again preach to his people, or they be willing to hear him, if his preaching, and their hearing, was to be conſequent upon the proof he could give, that the Biſhop, who ordained him, had in a direct line ſucceeded ſome one of the Apoſtles. I cannot therefore but eſteem it highly raſh and extravagant in him to ſay, that, if the ſucceſſion could be proved to have been broken, " Chriſt has neglected to provide for his Church in a caſe eſſential to the very being of it".

We again agree with the Dr. when he ſays, " that the Apoſtles underſtood the laws of Chriſt— " that they were conducted by the Spirit of God— " that they have given explicit and particular rules " for the government of the Church—that the

" public practice of the Apoſtles is a faithful and " plain comment on the laws of Chriſt, and of " equal authority with any written inſtructions— " that our bleſſed Saviour committed the govern- " ment of his Church to them—that this govern- " ment was exerciſed by them—and that they con- " veyed it to others, to be communicated to others " ſtill to the lateſt poſterity". Thus far we are perfectly agreed; but we muſt now part again. We cannot ſay with the Dr. " that theſe ſucceſſors were an order diſtinct from, and ſuperior to, thoſe who are now called Preſbyters; and that none who were not of this higheſt order had the power of ordination & government committed to them". He has not ſeen fit to give us here the evidence upon which this point may be eſtabliſhed, leaſt it ſhould " lead him too far from his preſent deſign". It might therefore be ſufficient to ſay, it cannot reaſonably be expected we ſhould be bro't to be of his mind, until we have ſeen this proof, and are convinced by it. However, I ſhall not think it a going out of my way, juſt to remark one thing, which is unaccountably ſtrange, if Biſhops are, by apoſtolic appointment, an order of officers in the Church diſtinct from, and ſuperior to, Preſbyters. It is this. The Apoſtles have not any where given inſtructions, deſcriptive of the perſons fit for the work of the miniſtry, that are at all adapted to the ſuppoſition of a DIFFERENCE OF ORDER in the paſtoral office. Had there been ſuch a difference, different qualifications would have been requiſite to the ſutable diſcharge of the different truſts ariſing therefrom; and it might juſtly have been expected, that they would have diſtinguiſhed between the qualifications reſpectively proper for the management of each of theſe truſts.

truſts. But they no where thus diſtinguiſh. They no where intimate, that ſuch different endowments were neceſſary. Far from this, they have ſpecified the qualifications of ONE ORDER of paſtors only; as may be ſeen at large in the Epiſtles to Timothy and Titus. And, what may be worthy of ſpecial notice, they have been very particular in deſcribing the qualifications of this ONE ORDER, while they are totally ſilent with reſpect to the other that is pleaded for, though that other is ſaid to be by much the moſt honorable and important of the two. In like manner, they have no where laid down any rules for the guidance of ordainers in veſting ordinary miniſters with different degrees of power. They no where ſpeak of the inſtitution of two diſtinct orders of ſtanding paſtors; they no where give inſtructions to exerciſe the ordaining right conformably to this diſtinction, by placing ſome in an higher, others in a lower rank in the Church. The ſacred writings of the Apoſtles ſay nothing to ſuch a purpoſe as this: On the contrary, they preſent to our view a very full and explicit directory for the ordination of ONE ORDER ONLY of fixed paſtors. This we have in the Pauline inſtructions, referring to the ſettlement of the Churches in Crete. The great Apoſtle of the Gentiles gives it in charge to Titus, whom he left in this Iſland with a direct view to "ſet in order the things that were wanting", to ordain paſtors in the ſeveral Churches there. But what paſtors were they? Of a different rank, ſome ſuperior, others inferior? Not a word leading to ſuch a thought is to be found throughout his whole Epiſtle. No; but the paſtors he directs ſhould be ordained were preciſely of the ſame rank or degree: Nor did Titus ordain any other. He could

not

not indeed have done it, unleſs he had acted counter to the direction he had received from the inſpired Paul. Should it be ſaid here, Titus was himſelf, at this time, the ſole Biſhop of Crete, and as ſuch intruſted with the ſole power of ordaining inferior paſtors; the anſwer is, this cannot be ſupported upon juſt and ſolid grounds. It is a meer pretence, as we have often had occaſion to make very clearly evident.

The Dr. now proceeds to conſider the evidence, in favor of Epiſcopacy, in his ſenſe of it, "from the general ſtate of the primitive Church". If, when he ſays, "it is a known fact, that all the "Churches that were gathered, during the *firſt* "Century, by the Apoſtles, or their Miſſionaries, "were under the direction of ſome one or other of "that venerable order; that men of the moſt e-"minent piety, who had been honored with their "acquaintance, were appointed by them to ſuper-"intend Churches in certain diſtricts, ſome of "whom were choſen to ſucceed them in thoſe "Churches which they had always kept under "their own immediate inſpection"; I ſay, if by this fact he means, that the perſons appointed by the Apoſtles in their day, or choſen afterwards, *within this Century*, to ſucceed them in ſuperintending the Churches, were officers of a ſuperior order to thoſe, who are called, in the New-teſtament, ſometimes Biſhops, ſometimes Preſbyters, meaning by theſe names one and the ſame order of men, he ſhould have given better proof of it, than a bare declaration, that "nothing but groſs prejudice, or a wrangling and captious diſpoſition, to ſay nothing worſe, could lead any to ſuſpect or aſſert" the contrary. He is much miſtaken, if he imagines,

imagines, that prejudice, or wrangling captiouſneſs, or any thing worſe, is confined to Preſbyterians. The ſticklers for Prelacy are as much, not to ſay a great deal more, under the influence of theſe fatal hindrances to the reception of "the truth in the love of it". All he has ſaid here in favor of Epiſcopacy, in the ſenſe he underſtands it, reſts ſolely upon his meer affirmation.

He goes on, "if we conſider the general character of Chriſtians, and the ſtate of the Church, in the *ſecond* and *third* Centuries, we ſhall not find it eaſie to believe, that there could have been any eſſential departure from the original plan of diſcipline and government committed to the Church". There certainly was not. The ſtate of things was not much varied from this plan, within the *ſecond* Century. Biſhops were not as yet known, as an order in the Church diſtinct from, and ſuperior to, Preſbyters. The promiſcuous uſe of the terms Biſhop and Preſbyter was ſtill in uſe; nor is that mode of diction, Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, to be met with in any writer before Clement of Alexandria, who did not flouriſh until the latter end of this *ſecond* Century, unleſs we except Ignatius, * in whoſe corrupted and interpolated

* The Dr. in a marginal note, pag. 8, 9. is pleaſed to offer a few words in favor of the *Ignatian Epiſtles*, in oppoſition to Dr. Chauncy's Dudleian Lecture at the College in Cambridge; in which he endeavoured to invalidate their teſtimony. Says Dr. Chandler, "he undoubtedly knows that he has been able to offer nothing *new* on ſo exhauſted a ſubject". He did not aim at this; though he may have added ſome *new* thoughts, at leaſt the old ones are placed in a *new* light. It follows, "and others know, that he has ſaid nothing againſt

lated Epiſtles, this manner of ſpeaking is common. If, when the Dr. ſpeaks of the "writings of the fathers that are ſtill extant, their apologies, private

gainſt the authenticity of theſe Epiſtles, but what has, long ago, been fairly and fully confuted". This is an eaſie way to anſwer any thing. He would have done himſelf much more honor, as a man of learning, if, in a way of ſolid argument, he had himſelf taken off the force of what had been objected againſt the authenticity of theſe Epiſtles. The author of the DUDLEIAN diſcourſe thought it below him to reject the *Ignatian Epiſtles* as corrupt, and not to be depended on, becauſe great and learned men knew this to be the real truth; but he was at the pains, in a courſe of juſt reaſoning, to evince it to be ſo. Meer affirmations, in controverted points, however ſanguinely delivered, are meer nothings, and accounted ſo by all capable judges.

He ſays farther, "although the advocates for Epiſcopacy ſee no neceſſity for giving up the teſtimony of Ignatius, it is not from an opinion that their cauſe would labor under any great diſtreſs without that ſupport". We are not very ſtrongly inclined to give full credit to what is here delivered. Ignatius is the only writer, until towards the cloſe of the ſecond Century, that is of any ſervice to the Epiſcopal cauſe. Prelatical writers know it, and accordingly repair to his Epiſtles as their Sheet-anchor; and they did ſo, with as much zeal and aſſurance as they do now, when they had no copies of theſe Epiſtles, but ſuch as, at this day, are acknowledged by Epiſcopalians themſelves to have been ſo corrupted and interpolated, as not to be capable of a juſt vindication. If they had thought their cauſe "would not have labored under diſtreſs" without theſe Epiſtles, they would not have been at ſuch immenſe pains to purge them, and ſupport their authority for their proper uſe.

The Dr. exclaims, "hard is the fate of ancient writers! "For, if they do not countenance modern opinions, "the authority of their writings will be diſputed. And "when an obſtinate oppoſition is once undertaken, "whether from intereſt, or ſpleen and malignity, no "ancient

private epistles, the regulations and decrees of councils, and the report of ecclesiastical historians, as exhibiting evidence of irresistable force, in favor of Episcopacy" ; I say, if he means, by these ancient records, such as are to be met with in the TWO FIRST Centuries, he is grosly mistaken while

D he

" ancient authors are so secure, not even those of some " of the holy Bible, but that such adventurers may be " able to do some injury to their reputation and autho- " rity". Had not the Dr. been himself most evidently under the prevailing influence of Interest, or Malignity, or both, or something worse, when he wrote this, it would not have had a place here. He knows, or might have known, if he had read even Episcopal writers, and these only, that KNAVISH FORGERIES were common, even in those times that are called primitive. Scarce one of the Apostles, or first Christian fathers, have escaped being personated by some wretched impostor, in some work or other sent into the world under their name. Even Jesus Christ himself has been thus basely used. One must be quite unacquainted with the ancient writings not to know this. Nay, it is the truth of fact, and acknowledged to be so, not only by Episcopalians, but even Roman-Catholic-Writers, that IGNATIUS in particular has been most fraudulently dealt with, no less than EIGHT of the fifteen Epistles that bear his name being FORGERIES ; yea, it is fact likewise, and owned to be so, that the OTHER SEVEN, before the editions of Usher and Vossius, had been so CORRUPTED by some knavish interpolator, that they ought not to be received as his genuine works. Their great advocate and defender, Bishop Pearson, expresly declines the vindication of them, in their old editions, notwithstanding the care and pains of Vedelius to purge them. Had the Dr. attended to these indubitable facts, he would not have made the above bitter complaint ; much less would he have inserted his narrative from Father *Hardouin*, which is as much to the purpose, as if he had told the story of a cock, and a bull, and three ram-chickens, with which the children are sometimes diverted,

he thinks, that they will be of any ſervice to the Prelatical cauſe. Ignatius excepted, whoſe Epiſtles have been proved, in the DUDLEIAN-DISCOURSE, to have been ſo corrupted as to be unworthy of notice, none of the primitive writers, within this period, ſpeak of the government of the Church, as committed to Biſhops, in the ſenſe here contended for. If Epiſcopalians are pleaſed to affirm the contrary, let it be remembered, the *onus probandi* lies with them; and if they can, let them give us good evidence, that any of theſe writers ſay, that Biſhops are an order in the Church ſuperior to Preſbyters; that ordination was the peculiar work of Biſhops, in diſtinction from Preſbyters; that Epiſcopal government was that by which the Church was governed; and that this form of government was inſtituted by Chriſt, or his Apoſtles. Until they do this, which we know it is not in their power to do, we ſhall continue of the mind, that no more can be collected from the fathers, within this period, than from the ſcriptures themſelves, to give countenance to Epiſcopacy, in the view in which we oppoſe it.

IF, by the writings of the fathers referred to, the Dr. means the fathers AFTER the ſecond Century, and downwards, we don't think any teſtimonies from them will be much to the purpoſe; as it is well known to all, who know any thing of antiquity, that we are NOW got into thoſe times, in which there was a deviation from the purity and ſimplicity of the goſpel, in many other things beſides this of the government of the Church. We are free to acknowledge, that, in the *third* Century, there began to appear a departure from the original plan of government in the Church. Biſhops were

were now diſtinguiſhed from Preſbyters; though, to aſcertain the preciſe idea meant by this diſtinction, will, I believe, be found, upon tryal, to be exceeding difficult. It is indubitably clear, that the Church was governed, AS YET, by Preſbyters as well as Biſhops: Nor does it appear, that a Biſhop was NOW any thing more than the head of a SINGLE flock or congregation, the affairs of which were managed, not by the Biſhop ALONE, as though all power was veſted in him; but by its Preſbyters alſo, united in one common council. This is plainly viſible thro' the whole of Cyprian's writings. Nay, that wonder of learning, Profeſſor Jameſon, is very poſitive in it, that, in the opinion of Cyprian himſelf, Biſhops were no otherwiſe ſuperior to Preſbyters, than Peter was to the other Apoſtles, the FIRST, the HEAD, of one and the ſame order in the Church. * But, whatever the diſtinction was, that might take place, in time, between Biſhops and Preſbyters, it was undoubtedly ſmall in its beginnings. The Biſhop was, at firſt, only PRIMUS INTER PARES, the Head-Preſbyter, the præſes of the conſiſtory; and it was gradually and imperceptibly that he attained to that dignity and power, with which he was afterwards veſted. It did not come into event at once. It was the work of time, and a long time too. From Prime-Preſbyters aroſe Biſhops; from City-Biſhops, Biſhops whoſe power extended to the neighbouring Country-Churches; and, when chriſtianity had got the ſecular arm on its ſide, and corruption had increaſed therewith, as it haſtily did to a monſtrous height, we now hear of Dioceſan Biſhops; from theſe aroſe Metropolitans; from Metropolitans, Patriarchs; and finally, at the top of all, his

 highneſs,

* See his Cyprianus Iſotimus, chap. 4th, throughout.

holineſs, the POPE, claiming the character of univerſal Head of the Church. This ſtate of things came on inſenſibly, ſtep by ſtep, and not all at once. It began, in a degree, even in the Apoſtles days, diſcovering itſelf in the pride of Diotrephes, who "deſired the preheminence"; and it went on increaſing, until the riſe of that amazing power, which for ſo many Centuries, has oppreſſed, and deſtroyed, the ſaints of the moſt high God.

THIS will reaſonably and fully account for "a departure from the original plan of government", without its making at firſt, or in its gradual advances for a while, "any violent ſtruggles and convulſions". According to the prophetic declaration of the Apoſtle Paul, it was to come on MYSTERIOUSLY; and ſo it did in fact, and inſenſibly too, until the powers of this world could be called in to the aid of aſpiring graſping Clergymen; and then there was buſtle, ſtruggling, and noiſe enough: For, from this time, we read of little elſe, in Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, but the ſquabbles of ſome of the Clergy, and their artful, and ſometimes perfidious, managements to enrich and aggrandize themſelves, to the depreſſion of others; until, at length, he that is called THE SON OF PERDITION became the MAN OF SIN grown up to his fullneſs of ſtature.

THE Dr. has introduced that truly great man, Mr. Chillingworth, ſaying, "when I ſhall ſee all the "fables in the *Metamorphoſis* acted, and prove "true ſtories; when I ſhall ſee all the Democracies "and Ariſtocraſies in the world lie down and ſleep, "and awake into Monarchies; then will I begin "to believe, that Preſbyterian government, hav-"ing continued in the Church, during the Apo-

"ſtles

" ſtles times, ſhould preſently after (againſt the " Apoſtles doctrine and the will of Chriſt) be " whirled about like a ſcene in a Maſque, and traſ- " formed into Epiſcopacy". I alſo ſhall inſert a few paſſages from this celebrated writer, leaving it with the Public to judge, whoſe quotations, the Dr's or mine, reflect moſt honor on him, and are the ſtrongeſt illuſtration of his real greatneſs.— Says he, " By the religion of Proteſtants, I do not underſtand the doctrine of Luther, or Calvin, or Melancton; nor the confeſſion of Auguſta, or Geneva; nor the catechiſm of Heidelburg; nor the articles of the Church of England; no, nor the harmony of the Proteſtant confeſſions: But that in which they all agree, and which they all ſubſcribe with a greater harmony, as a perfect rule of their faith and actions; that is, the BIBLE. The Bible, I ſay, the Bible ONLY is the religion of Proteſtants.—I, for my part, after a long, and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial ſearch of the true way to eternal happineſs, do profeſs plainly, that I cannot find any reſt for the ſole of my foot, but upon THIS ROCK ONLY. I ſee plainly, and with my own eyes, that there are Popes againſt Popes, Councils againſt Councils, ſome Fathers againſt others, the ſame Fathers againſt themſelves, a conſent of Fathers of one age againſt a conſent of Fathers of another age, the Church of one age againſt the Church of another age.—In a word, there is no ſufficient certainty but of ſcripture only, for any conſidering man to build upon. THIS therefore, and this ONLY, I have reaſon to believe; this I will profeſs; according to this I will live; and for this, if there be occaſion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly loſe my life; though I ſhould be ſorry that Chriſtians ſhould take it from me.

me. Propoſe me any thing out of this book, and require whether I believe it, or no; and ſeem it never no incomprehenſible to human reaſon, I will ſubſcribe it with hand, and heart; as knowing, no demonſtration can be ſtronger than this, God has ſaid ſo, therefore it is true". * It is ſtrange that one, who could make ſo good a judgment of the ancient Fathers, and give his ſentiments concerning them with ſuch exact truth, and ſound reaſon, ſhould afterwards write in the manner he is here repreſented to have done in relation to Epiſcopacy. It is certain, he was wrought upon, by the famous Jeſuit, who went under the name of John Fiſher, to forſake the communion of the Church of England, and to embrace the Romiſh religion, and to do it with an incredible ſatisfaction of mind. Perhaps, the beſt way to account for the extravagant mode of language in which he writes of Epiſcopacy, is to ſuppoſe, that he was under ſome undue influence from thoſe arguments which had induced him to profeſs himſelf a Roman-Catholic. And there may be the more reaſon to ſuſpect this, as, after his converſion from Popery, it appears, from a letter of his to Dr. Sheldon, "that he had ſcruples about leaving the Church of Rome, and returning to the Church of England"; which ſcruples he freely declared to his friends. † I ſhall only add here, much greater men, than Mr. Chillingworth, for knowledge in Antiquity, if not for reaſoning powers, and in the communion of the Church of England too, not to ſay any thing of others,

* Religion of Proteſtants, a ſafe way to ſalvation, chap. 6. ſect. 56.

† Bayle's Critic. Dict. in the edition that contains the lives never before publiſhed, under the name, Chillingworth.

others, quite differ from him upon the head of Epiſcopacy, and as urged hereto from their intimate acquaintance with the writings of the fathers, as well as the ſacred ſcriptures. That great Antiquary, the learned Arch-Biſhop Uſher, in a letter to Dr. Bernard, ſays, "I have ever declared my opinion to be, that "Epiſcopus et Preſbyter, gradu tantum differunt, non ordine"; that is, Biſhop and Preſbyter DIFFER ONLY IN DEGREE, not in ORDER. And, in the cloſe of this letter, he adds, "for the teſtifying my communion with theſe Churches, [the reformed ones in France and Holland] which I do love and honor as true members of the Church univerſal, I do profeſs, that, with like affection, I ſhould receive the bleſſed ſacrament at the hands of the *Dutch* miniſters, if I was in Holland; as I ſhould do at the hands of *French* miniſters, if I were in *Charentone*.* The celebrated Biſhop Burnet ſays, "I the more willingly incline to believe Biſhops and Preſbyters to be SEVERAL DEGREES OF THE SAME OFFICE; ſince the names of Biſhops and Preſbyters are uſed for the ſame thing in ſcripture, and are alſo uſed promiſcuouſly by the writings of the two firſt Centuries". † I ſhall only mention farther the learned Dr. Stillingfleet, who was as well verſed in the fathers as any man, in his day, or ſince. His words are theſe, ‡ "I believe, upon the ſtricteſt inquiry, Medina's judgment will prove true, that Jerom, Auſtin, Ambroſe, Sedulius, Primaſius, Chryſoſtom, Theodoret, Theophylact, were all of Aerius's judgment as to the IDENTITY of both name and order of Biſhops and Preſbyters in the primitive Church". And

* The judgment of the late Arch-Biſhop of Armagh, on ſeveral points, by R. Bernard, D. D. pag. 125, 126.

† Vind. of the Church of Scotland. ‡ Iren. pag. 276.

And again, a little onwards, " I do as yet deſpair of finding any one ſingle teſtimony in all Antiquity, which doth in plain terms aſſert Epiſcopacy, as it was ſettled by the practice of the primitive Church in the ages following the Apoſtles, to be of UNALTERABLE DIVINE RIGHT".

THE two propoſitions, from which the conſequences are drawn which finiſh this Section, are both utterly denied; and, upon what has been offered, we may fairly and juſtly ſay in direct contradiction to them:

THAT Epiſcopal government was not at all, much leſs univerſally, received in the Church PRESENTLY AFTER the Apoſtles times.

THERE is therefore no room for the ſuppoſition of an alteration in this Government PRESENTLY AFTER theſe times; and, in fact, there was no ſuch SPEEDY alteration.

EPISCOPACY therefore was not ſo ancient as is pretended, nor is there any need, or reaſon, to ſuppoſe, or ſay, it was apoſtolic.

ANSWER

ANSWER to SECTION II. which ſays, "The Powers peculiar to the Epiſcopal Office are *Government*, *Ordination*, and *Confirmation*".

THE Dr's buſineſs here is to explain, and eſtabliſh, the proper ſuperiority of Biſhops to Preſbyters. In order to this, he previouſly endeavours to ſeparate, what he calls, the APPENDAGES to the Epiſcopal office, from the powers that eſſentially belong to it. And here he ſays, "every one knows, that the office of a Clergyman is the ſame, whether he is poſſeſſed of a Fortune, or is without one; whether he has a large Pariſh, or a ſmall one". And ſo "with regard to place, he who has a ſmall Dioceſs has the ſame Epiſcopal power, as he who has a large one; and it matters not, as to the validity of the act, whether it be performed by the Biſhop of Man, or the Arch-Biſhop of Canterbury". The queſtion is not, whether theſe and ſuch like APPENDAGES to the Epiſcopal-office will be deſtructive of the powers, which, by the inſtitution of Chriſt, eſſentially belong to it; but whether they do not unfit the perſons veſted with it for the proper diſcharge of the duties of it? Inſomuch, that it would be highly unreaſonable to add ſuch Appendages to the office, and as much ſo to expect, if they are added, that chriſtian profeſſors ſhould not complain of it as an intolerable

grievance. If it " matters not, as to the validity of the act", whether a Biſhop has a ſingle congregation for his charge, or ſeveral hundred, it certainly does as to his capacity to ſerve the great ends of his office. I ſuppoſe the Dr. would not ſay, it would deſtroy the " validity" of a Biſhop's act, was he an univerſal one, as the POPE is; but there are few, I believe, but would think it " mattered much", whether there was ſuch a Biſhop, or not. And the clothing Biſhops with worldly dignity and power, and placing them at the head of large Dioceſſes, is, in proportion, the ſame incongruity; and, inſtead of ſerving the true ſpiritual intereſt of the Church of Chriſt, has been greatly detrimental to it in all ages, from Conſtantine to this day; and, I am perſuaded, will ever be ſo.

THE Dr. now comes to the conſideration of " thoſe powers that are peculiar to Biſhops, and without which they would ceaſe to be Biſhops"; and theſe, he ſays, " will be found to be the powers of *government*, *ordination*, and *confirmation*".

HE begins with the " power or right of government", in ſupport of which he has offered three things.

ONE is, that " this right is neceſſarily included in the ſuperiority of their office". He does not here, as might have been expected, in ſo important a matter, go into the conſideration of the nature of this office, proving herefrom its ſuperiority, in the ſenſe he affixes to this word. By the governing power he would make eſſential to the Epiſcopal office, he means a monarchical power, ſuch an one as may be exerciſed without ſubordi-

nate

nate officers, yea, in oppoſition to them. But, ſurely, ſuch a power as this is not "neceſſarily included" in meer ſuperiority of office. This ſuperiority there may be, and this there has been, and now is, in many ſocieties, where the power of the higheſt office, among ſubordinate ones, is not the power of an abſolute Monarch, which knows no check but his own ſovereign pleaſure. Nothing therefore is yet ſaid, that has the appearance of ſolid argument.

ANOTHER thing is, "that this power was conveyed from the Apoſtles to their ſucceſſors, the Biſhops; that it was exerciſed by Timothy, Titus, and others; and that it has, through all ages of the Church, been tranſmitted down, and maintained by the Epiſcopal order". So the Dr. ſays, without adding one word by way of proof. It is very extraordinary, when he undertook to ſupport the ſuperiority of Biſhops in point of government, and as abſolute Monarchs too, that he ſhould do it in a dictatorial manner only; as though his affirmation would be eſteemed good evidence in the caſe. We muſt have a much better argument to convince us, that the exorbitant power he claims for Biſhops really belongs to them, than barely his ſaying, that it was "conveyed to them by the Apoſtles, and has been exerciſed by them ever ſince".

THE laſt thing is, the Epiſtles to the ſeven Churches of the Lydian-Aſia; which, ſays he, "are a proof, that the government of the Churches, reſpectively, was lodged in the hands of ſingle perſons, who are called Angels, by which was meant and intended, according to the voice

of united antiquity, Biſhops in the appropriated ſenſe". Here again he reſts this eſſential affair of the government of Biſhops upon meer affirmation; though he could not but know, that it has been proved, at leaſt in the opinion of Non-Epiſcopalians, an hundred times, that theſe "Argels" were not Biſhops, "in his appropriated ſenſe". This is all, however ſtrange it may appear to the reader, that the Dr. has been pleaſed to ſay in defence of that ſuper-intending, abſolutely monarchical power he eſſentially connects with the Epiſcopal office. If nothing more can be offered in proof of this claim, it is, without all doubt, an unjuſtifiable one; and we may juſtly look upon ſuch power, wherever exerciſed, as a real uſurpation; eſpecially, if the two following paſſages of ſcripture, among many others that might be mentioned, are attended to. The firſt is in the Acts of the Apoſtles, chap. 20. 17. "And from Miletus, he [Paul] ſent to Epheſus, and called the Elders [Preſbuterous, the Preſbyters] of the Church". It follows, ver. 28. "Take heed to your ſelves, and to all the flock, over which the holy Ghoſt hath made you overſeers [Epiſcopous, Biſhops] to feed [Poimainein] the Church of God". Two things are here obviouſly diſcernable. One is, that, in the opinion of the apoſtle Paul, Preſbyters and Biſhops are one and the ſame officers in the Church; for he promiſcuouſly makes uſe of theſe names, in the ſame diſcourſe, to point out preciſely the ſame perſons. The other is, that the work proper to Preſbyters is that of "feeding the flock of God"; an alluſion to the buſineſs of Shepherds, which eſſentially includes in it the inſpection and government of the Sheep committed to their care. "To feed", [Poimainein] is often uſed to ſignifie the whole

duty

duty of the Governor of a family, and of thoſe Governors alſo who are at the head of Kingdoms. In Revel. 2. 27. it is ſaid of Chriſt, in his character as "Lord of all", that Poimanei autous, "he ſhall rule them [the nations] with a rod of Iron". The other text of ſacred writ is that in Peter's firſt Epiſtle, 5th chap, firſt and ſecond verſes, "The Elders [Preſbuterous] which are among you I exhort, who am alſo an Elder;—feed [Poimanate] the Church of God, which is among you, taking the overſight thereof", Epiſcopountes, acting the part of Biſhops towards them. It is plain, from this paſſage, that the work of inſtructing and governing the Church of God properly belongs to Preſbyters: Nor could it well have been more plainly and fully expreſſed; for they are not only exhorted, by an inſpired Pen, to "feed the Church of God"; but to do it, Epiſcopountes, acting in the character, and performing the proper work of Biſhops; which ſurely includes government, as well as inſtruction. If governing authority is not, in theſe texts, committed to Preſbyters, and by apoſtolic inſtitution too, there are no words in which it can be done. Let the Dr. produce only a ſingle paſſage, any where in the New teſtament, that mentions Biſhops, in his appropriated ſenſe, and entruſts them with the affair of Church-Government, and we will then acknowledge he has done ſomething to good purpoſe; which we do not think he has done as yet.

ANOTHER power belonging to Biſhops, ſays the Dr. is "*ordination*; which has always been conſidered by the friends of Epiſcopacy, as PECULIAR to Biſhops, and UNALIENABLE from their office". He does not here ſpeak the truth of fact, even

ſince

ſince the ſettlement of Epiſcopacy in England, after the reformation. The firſt reformers, and hundreds of others, all along from their day, of high dignity in the Church, and the beſt character for piety and learning, have been of our mind as to the Identity of Biſhops and Preſbyters, and that ordination was appropriated to Biſhops by human conſtitution only.

The Dr. goes on, " with regard to the power of ordination, none, that have labored in the cauſe, have been able to ſhew from ſcripture a ſingle inſtance, wherein this power has been exercited by Preſbyters only". He ſhould have added, in his opinion; for, in the opinion of judges far more learned in the ſcriptures, and all other wrtings, than he or I can modeſtly pretend to be, inſtances of this power of Preſbyters have been produced, and ſuch asEpiſcopalians have never yet been able to ſet aſide. He ſubjoins, in the immediately following words, " but there are many inſtances in which, thoſe who are manifeſtly ſuperior to Preſbyters are found to have uſed it". Let him give us, from the ſcripture, if he can, a ſingle inſtance of ordination by any ORDINARY FIXED officer in the Church, that was of an higher order than that of Preſbyters. It is certain, though we have examples, in ſcripture, of ordination by extraordinary and ordinary officers, by Apoſtles, by Evangeliſts, by Teachers, or common Paſtors or Preſbyters; yet, we no where read, throughout the New-teſtament, of ſo much as one ordination by any perſon under the name or ſtile of a Biſhop. If what I ſay does not conſiſt with exact truth, the miſtake may be eaſily ſhewn; as the ſacred books are open to every one's view.

The

THE Dr. proceeds, "as to the caſe of Timothy, whom St. Paul exhorts, in his firſt Epiſtle to him, "not to neglect the gift which was given him by prophecy, *with* the laying on of the hands of the Preſbytery", it will not anſwer the purpoſe". And why? Becauſe "in his ſecond Epiſtle to him, he expreſly aſſerts, that this ſame gift was imparted to him" *by* the laying on of his own hands". But how does the Dr. know, that the apoſtle *Paul* is ſpeaking of one and the ſame gift, in both theſe texts? He ſhould have given us ſome proof of his knowledge, as to this point; for it is far from being certain, that the ſame gift is ſpoken of in theſe different Epiſtles, wrote at different times. Some of the beſt writers think it moſt probable, that different gifts are meant in theſe paſſages. But ſhould it be ſuppoſed, not granted, that the ſame gift is ſpoken of in both texts, and that this gift was the power communicated by ordination, how does it appear, that it was given by "the laying on of Paul's hands" only, and not by "the hands of the Preſbytery" as truly? It is as poſitively ſaid, in the firſt Epiſtle, that it was given "with the laying on of the hands of the Preſbytery", as it is, in the ſecond, that it was "by the laying on of Paul's hands". What then? Says the Dr. "obſerve the difference between BY and WITH. Timothy received this gift "BY the impoſition of St. Paul's hands", as being effectual to convey it; but it was only "WITH the impoſition of the hands of the Preſbytery", which implies not any power in them, but their concurrence only". Notably ſaid! An irrefragable argument truly! The diſtinction the Dr. here makes between the juſt import of the prepoſitions, meta, and dia, is altogether groundleſs, and could be contrived for no other reaſon than

than to ſerve a preſent turn. Theſe prepoſitions are commonly uſed, in the New-teſtament, as carrying in them the ſame force. An obſervable inſtance of this we have in the 15th chap. of the Acts. In the 4th ver. it is ſaid of Paul and Barnabas, that "they declared all things God had done [meta] with them". In the 12th ver. the ſame thought is thus expreſſed, they "declared what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles [dia] by them". The prepoſition, meta, in the 4th ver. has exactly the ſame force with the prepoſition dia in the 12th ver. and might, with equal propriety, have been rendered *by*, as it is in the 12th ver. An inſtrumental efficiency is the thing meant in both places. Many more inſtances might be brought of the like uſe of theſe prepoſitions, but that it would take up more room than can be here ſpared. The Dr's ſuggeſting, that holy orders were conveyed to Timothy, ſolely *by* Paul's hands, in virtue of the force of the prepoſition dia; while, in virtue of the force of the word meta, *with*, nothing more is imported, by the impoſition of the hands of the Preſbytery, than their concurring with, or approbating the apoſtle Paul's act, which wholly communicated the power, is nothing better than an arbitrary invention to ſupport a ſinking cauſe. In this view of the matter, any private members of the Church might have "laid on hands" in Timothy's ordination, with as much pertinency as it's Preſbyters. It cannot, with the leaſt ſhadow of reaſon, be ſuppoſed, that an inſpired Apoſtle would have called in a number of Preſbyters to join with him in the ſacred ſolemnity of "impoſing hands", if they had not a right, as officers in the Church of Chriſt, to perform this action; and their performing it is a

ſure

ſure argument of their right to do the thing intended by it, that is, ſeparate a perſon to the work of the Goſpel-miniſtry: As they that have a right to apply water in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the holy Ghoſt, have a right to baptiſe; and they that have a right to ſet apart bread and wine, and diſtribute it to the people, have a right to adminiſter the Lord's ſupper.

I CANNOT help obſerving here, if it had been in the Dr's power to have turned us to a text of ſcripture, in which it is declared, that the miniſterial gift was given "WITH [meta] the laying on of the hands of the EPISCOPATE, he would have triumphed in it, as a deciſive argument in his favor. And ſhould it have been objected, that this gift was alſo ſaid to be given "BY [dia] the laying on of the hands of Paul", and that, in conſideration of the peculiar force of the prepoſition BY [dia] HE it was that conveyed the gift; but that the EPISCOPATE only ſignified their concurrence in the affair; I ſay, ſhould ſuch an objection have been made, I doubt not, it would have been attributed to a "wrangling captious diſpoſition", not to ſay any thing worſe.

IT is added, in the next following words, "St. Paul could have ordained without their concurrence, but the impoſition of their hands would have been altogether unavailable without his". We ſay, on the contrary, and our bare word carries as much convincing weight with it as their's, that this Preſbyterian-conſiſtory might have ordained Timothy without the apoſtle Paul, as he might have done it without them; and, in either caſe, the ordination would have been valid to all the

purpoſes of the Goſpel-miniſtry. If the paſſion of ſhame, excited in the Dr. had operated with a little more ſtrength, he would not, by "repeating things which have been ſo frequently ſaid by others", have made it neceſſary that we alſo ſhould do the ſame.

He has ſeen fit to ſay only two things more, in ſupport of the peculiar unalienable right of Biſhops, in the appropriated ſenſe, to ordain.

The firſt is, that "no inſtance of ordination, performed by meer Preſbyters, can be found in the Church for ſeveral ages. Aerius & Colluthus, in the fourth Century, ſeem to have been the firſt contrivers of ordinations of this ſort". So we were told in a book, intituled "a modeſt proof of the Government ſettled by Chriſt and his Apoſtles in the Church", publiſhed here and diſperſed about forty years ago; which was ſoon anſwered by the late worthy Dr. Wiggleſworth, and in ſo maſterly a way, in his "ſober remarks", that this bluſtering pretence has lain dorment ever ſince; and it would have been more to the Dr's honor to have ſuffered it to continue in this ſtate of oblivion, than to have revived it with only a bare mention of it, and refering his readers to "Hooker's Eccleſ. Polity, and Arch-Biſhop Potter's very excellent diſcourſe of Church-government". Epiphanius was the firſt that found fault with Aerius, ſtigmatiſing him as an Heretic. And why did he thus condemn him? Was it *only* or *meerly* for his opinion concerning the *parity* of Biſhops and Preſbyters? Far from it. He zealouſly oppoſed the lawfulneſs of PRAYING FOR THE DEAD. Epiphanius was a ſtickler for this rank ſuperſtition, now coming into practice, and

and could not bear to have it expoſed. The Hereſies therefore he taxed Aerius with, were the IDENTITY of Biſhops and Preſbyters, and the unlawfulneſs of PRAYING FOR THE DEAD; Hereſies, as Dr. Wiggleſworth writes, "of much "the ſame nature, and Epiphanius's confutation "of them both equally learned and ſatisfactory: "For it is obſervable, that, in the ſame place, "where he condemns that monſtrous Hereſy of "the Identity of order, he fairly confeſſes, "that, "by the two orders of Preſbyters and Deacons, all "Eccleſiaſtical offices might be performed". To "this I ſhall only add the words of the learned "Dr. Stillingfleet, who ſays, if Aerius was an "Heretic for holding the *Identity of order*, it is "ſtrange that Epiphanius ſhould be the firſt man "that ſhould charge him with it; and that neither "Socrates, Sozoman, Theodoret, nor Evagrius, "before whoſe time he lived, ſhould cenſure him for "it. And why ſhould not Jerom have been equally "animadverted upon, who is as expreſs in this as "any man in the world". * There was no need, nor any reaſon, to join *Colluthus* with *Aerius*; for he did not act in the capacity of, what Epiſcopalians would call, a meer Preſbyter, in the buſineſs of *ordaining*; but as a Biſhop. Dr. Stillingfleet has proved, from Blondel's apology, that he was a Biſhop of the Meletian party in Cynus, and is ſuppoſed to have been ordained a Biſhop by Meletius. †

As the Dr. has been pleaſed to ſay, "no inſtance of an ordination by meer Preſbyters can be found

* Sober remarks, pag. 4, 5. † Vid. Irenicum, pag. 381;—and more largely Blondel's apology, Sect. 3. from 317, to 327.

in the Church for ſeveral ages", we might naturally conclude there are numerous examples of Epiſcopal ordination in theſe ſeveral ages. We ſhould take it kindly to have pointed out to us ſo much as ONE inſtance, within the long period of an hundred and fifty years from Chriſt, of an ordination by any Biſhop, in any part of the chriſtian world; meaning by a Biſhop, an officer in the Church of a ſuperior order to that of Preſbyters. I have lately been looking over the extracts I made twenty years ago, from the fathers of the two firſt Centuries, containing every thing in their writings that might be thought to have relation to the preſent controverſy; and I don't find a ſingle example of an ordination by Biſhops, in the appropriated ſenſe, within the time before ſpecified. If the Dr. would preſent us with one from his own knowledge, or by communication from the convened body that appointed him to write, it would be, to me, a great favor, as hereby I might fill up an eſſential vacancy in my extracts, and render them quite perfect: And, beſides it's being a gratification to me, it would be a vaſt help to the Epiſcopal cauſe, and, in a good meaſure, juſtifie the Challenge, prelatical writers ſometimes triumphantly make, calling upon their opponents to give an inſtance of Preſbyterian-ordination for ſome Centuries.

THE other thing, with which the Dr. finiſhes what he thought proper to ſay upon the head of ordination, is, that "from this time, [the fourth Century] until after the beginning of the reformation in the ſixteenth Century, no inſtances worthy of notice occur to favor ordination by Preſbyters". He had before ſaid, Aerius and Colluthus were

were the firſt contrivers of ordination by Preſbyters; ſo that, according to him, there were no inſtances in this kind until the fourth Century, the age in which they lived. How does this agree with the account of Eutichius, who ſays, "that the twelve Preſbyters conſtituted by Mark, in the See of Alexandria, choſe out one of their number to be head over the reſt, and the other eleven, laid hands on him, and bleſſed him, and made him Patriarch"?—Or with the account, Jerom, more ancient than he, has given us of the ſame fact, ſaying, "at Alexandria, from St. Mark to Heraclius and Dionyſius, Biſhops, the Prieſts always took one out from among themſelves, whom they ſet in the higheſt ſeat, and called Biſhop, juſt as an army makes an Emperor, or as if the Deacons ſhould chuſe one out of their number, and call him an Arch-Deacon"? Theſe are inſtances that are to be met with in moſt writers on our ſide of the queſtion. A great variety of caſes alſo, in proof of Preſbyterian-ordination, within the time ſpecified by the Dr. may be ſeen in Dr. Stillingfleet's Irenicum, pag. 374. and onwards. He is egregiouſly miſtaken likewiſe in ſaying, that, from the fourth Century, until the beginning of the reformation in the ſixteenth, "no inſtances worthy of notice occur to favor ordination by Preſbyters". What he may think worthy of notice I cannot tell; but ordinations, in this kind, were common many ages before the reformation he ſpeaks of, and as worthy of ſpecial notice as any Epiſcopal ones ſince.* I would

* Says Mr. Daniel Williams, in his preface to Mr. J. Owen's plea for ſcripture-ordination, "the ancient Vaudois, or Waldenſes, thoſe eminent and faithful witneſſes againſt antichriſtian uſurpations, have had no ordination,

would here aſk the Dr. in the words of that eminently learned man, the late reverend Mr. Thomas Walter of Roxbury, "whether the Vaudois of "Piedmont were not much ancienter than two "hundred years? Leger has ſufficiently demon-"ſtrated their antiquity, and proved, that the "Waldenſes were long before the time of Peter "Valdo, which name (as they are now called "Vaudois from the word Vaux, that ſignifies a "valley) belonged to them as inhabiting the "vallies of the Alps. We will take their cha-"racter and hiſtory from a ſworn enemy of their's, "from Claudius Seſſelius, the Arch-Biſhop of "Turin, in a book which he wrote againſt them. "There he tells us, "that the ſeat of the Wal-"denſes took its riſe from a moſt religious perſon, "called Leo, that lived in the time of Conſtantine "the great, and who, deteſting the covetouſneſs "of Pope Sylveſter, and the immoderate bounty "of Conſtantine, choſe rather to embrace poverty "with the ſimplicity of the chriſtian faith, than "with Sylveſter to be defiled with fat and rich "benefices; and that all they who were ſeriouſly "religious,

dinations but by Preſbyters for five hundred years paſt. Hiſtory of the Vaudois, chap. 3. The firſt guides of the people from myſtical Egypt were Preſbyters ordained by Preſbyters. Theſe are they that gathered the firſt-fruits unto God.—They have gone in mourning from generation to generation.—They have been ſore broken in the place of dragons, and covered with the ſhadow of death; yet have they not forgotten the name of their God, or ſtretched out their hand to a ſtrange God. It is by the miniſtry of theſe that the truth prevailed, the eyes of nations were opened, and vaſt multitudes reduced to the obedience of the goſpel. They ſealed their miniſtry with their blood, and heaven ſealed it with the moſt glorious ſucceſs".

" religious, joined themſelves unto them". Alſo " RequerusSacco, the celebrated inquiſitor, quoted " by the Jeſuit Cretzer, in his Bibliotheque of the " fathers, aſſerts, " that among all the ſects there " is none that has been ſo pernicious to the Church " of Rome, as that of the Leoniſts, becauſe it is " the moſt ancient, and has continued longeſt : " For ſome affirm, that it began in the time of " Sylveſter, and others ſay, in the time of the " Apoſtles". The Fryar Belvedoras, excuſing the " Miſſionaries for their not converting one of " theſe Waldenſes, aſſigns this reaſon for it, " that " their Hereſie was too firmly rooted for any to be " able to do good among them : They of the " Valleys have been always, and through all times, " accounted Heretics". * So that, upon the whole, the Dr's " uniform practice of the Church for fifteen hundred years", is as deſtitute of evidence from antiquity, as the neceſſity of Epiſcopal ordination is from the ſcriptures.

He now comes to the laſt branch of the Epiſcopal office, " impoſition of hands in confirmation" ; concerning which, after explaining the nature and deſign of this rite, he ſays, " the Church of England declares, that it hath been a ſolemn, ancient and laudable cuſtom, continued from the Apoſtles time". And here his reaſoning is eminently curious. " If this cuſtom has been *from* the Apoſtles, it muſt have been practiſed *in* their time ; for, in the language of the ſchools, the *terminus à quo* is in the time of the Apoſtles. And it can with no propriety be ſaid to have been continued *from* their time, if it commenced

* Walter's Reply to the diſcourſe of Epiſcopacy, pag. 82, 83.

menced *after* it". Demonſtrably argued! But to what purpoſe? May it not be true, that this was a cuſtom neither in the Apoſtles days, nor within the truly primitive times, though it be granted the Church of England ſays "it continued from the Apoſtles times"; and if ſo, that it was their judgment, in conſequence of the Dr's learned reaſoning, that it was in uſe by the Apoſtles themſelves? Is infallibility the peculiar priviledge of this Church? Will it aſcertain the truth of a diſputed fact, to ſay the Church of England affirms it to be one? Some farther proof is neceſſary. The Dr. ſeems ſenſible of it, and goes on to "ſee what information the ſcripture gives us, relating to this ſubject". And he particularly mentions three texts to his purpoſe.

THE firſt is, Acts 8. 14—17. which gives an account of Peter and John as ſent to Samaria, who, when they were come, "prayed for them that they might receive the holy Ghoſt; and laying their hands on them, they received the holy Ghoſt". Theſe words, ſays the Dr. "exactly deſcribe confirmation as practiſed in the Church of England, and there is hardly room for a poſſibility of applying them to any thing elſe". It is as evident as words can well make it, that the impoſition of hands by the Apoſtles, ſpoken of in this text, was for the impartation of the holy Ghoſt in MIRACULOUS GIFTS. For it is ſaid of Simon the ſorcerer, ver. 13. that he "wondered, beholding the miracles and ſigns which were done"; and, in the 18th ver. that "when he ſaw, that, through the laying on of the Apoſtles hands, the holy Ghoſt was given", that is, a power to do thoſe miracles and ſigns, "he offered them money, ſaying, give me alſo this power, that on whomſoever I lay hands, he may receive the holy Ghoſt",

Ghoſt", that is, the ability of working wonders. Will the Dr. in ſober ſerioufneſs, ſay, that there is any likeneſs between the impoſition of a Biſhop's hands in confirmation, and this laying on of the Apoſtles hands, as to it's uſe and end? Was any miraculous power ever conveyed, in this way, by any Biſhop of the Church of England to any one his hands were laid upon? Does any Biſhop, ſince the days of Popery, pretend to impart this power? Why then is this text brought in proof of the doctrine of confirmation? Might it not be reaſonably thought, that prejudice itſelf could not find a poſſibility of applying it to this purpoſe?

THE ſecond text is that in Acts 20. 7. which contains, ſays the Dr. " another inſtance of confirmation in the diſciples at Epheſus, on whom, " after they were baptiſed", St. Paul " laid his hands, and the holy Ghoſt came upon them". He has here ſhamefully ſtopt ſhort in the middle of a ſentence, keeping out of ſight a neceſſary part of it. For it follows immediately, and in order to finiſh the ſentence, " and they SPAKE WITH TONGUES, and PROPHESIED". Is this fair? Does it carry the appearance of that impartial uprightneſs, which becomes every honeſt writer? Can any imaginable reaſon be aſſigned for his thus curtailing the text, but only this, that if he had given it in whole, it would have been, at once, viſible to his readers, that it was nothing to his purpoſe? And this will always be the truth, until it appears, that baptiſed perſons, upon a Biſhop's laying his hands on them, are able to " ſpeak with tongues, and propheſie".

THE laſt text is that in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, chap. 6. ver. 2. where, it's author, among other things, ſpeaks of " the laying on of hands".

We read of the Apoſtles, as "laying on their hands" in the following caſes; in ordination, in healing the ſick, and in conveying miraculous powers; but in no other that I can recollect at preſent. In whichſoever of theſe ſenſes "the laying on of hands" is here underſtood, it makes nothing to the Dr's purpoſe.

He takes notice of two objections againſt what he had offered, from ſcripture, in proof of this rite of confirmation.

One is, that "theſe inſtances prove only what was actually practiſed by the Apoſtles, but not that this rite was intended to be of ſtanding uſe to the Church in all ages". And, in reply, he roundly affirms, that "confirmation was practiſed by the IMMEDIATE ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles, and has been UNIVERSALLY CONTINUED through all the ages of the Church, until within theſe two Centuries"; and that this "muſt be confeſſed by all that have the LEAST ACQUAINTANCE with Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory". This is not the firſt time the Dr. has diſcovered his want of knowledge in the ancient writings; nor the firſt time he has, with great aſſurance, declared that to be true, which others know to be falſe. It is well known to thoſe, who are tolerably verſed in antiquity, though the Dr ſeems quite ignorant of it, that NO INSTANCE of confirmation is to be met with, in any of the writings of the fathers, until towards the cloſe of the ſecond, or rather the coming in of the third century. I now tell him what may appear a new and ſtrange thing to him, that Tertullian is the firſt father who ſpeaks of this rite of confirmation; and I could tell him of ſeveral other ſuperſtitious

ſtitious rites that were, by this time, brought into practice. And if he will be at the pains to conſult Mr. Pierce's vindication of Diſſenters, or the diſſenting Gentleman's anſwer to White, he will find, that confirmation, in thoſe days, was always performed, not as it is in the Church of England, but IMMEDIATELY after Baptiſm.

THE other objection the Dr. conſiders is, "that from the inſtances of confirmation [he ſhould have ſaid, of the laying on of the Apoſtles hands] recorded in ſcripture, the effects of it appear to have been miraculous; and as the power of miracles has long ſince ceaſed, this rite is now uſeleſs, and ought not to be continued". But, ſays he, "the ſolution of this objection is not difficult". How then does he ſolve it? Why, by cautiouſly avoiding to ſay any thing upon it that is really to the purpoſe. For though he ſays, miraculous gifts were imparted by the impoſition of the Apoſtles hands, and other gifts alſo of a different nature, meaning hereby "the gracious aſſiſtances of the holy Spirit, without which it is as certain now, as it ever was, that no man can fulfil the conditions of the Goſpel-covenant"; yet he does not venture to go on, and affirm, that either of theſe gifts are imparted by Biſhops to thoſe, upon whom they lay their hands in confirmation; or that Biſhops have, or pretend to have, in theſe days, this power of communication. And if they have no power to impart the holy Ghoſt, either in miraculous gifts, or gracious aſſiſtances, why ſhould they uſe that rite or ceremony by which the Apoſtles did this? "Might they not as well, to ſpeak here in the words of an excellent writer, * ſtretch themſelves

* Diſſent. Gentleman's anſwer to White, pag. 45.

upon the dead body of a child, in imitation of Eliſha; or, make ointment with ſpittle for the cure of the blind, in imitation of our Savior; or, anoint the ſick with oil, in imitation of the apoſtolic Elders; as pray, and lay their hands on thoſe who were baptiſed, in imitation of Peter and John, who did this to the Samaritan converts ONLY that they might receive the miraculous gifts and powers of the holy Ghoſt" ?

I SHALL finiſh what I have to ſay, upon this head of confirmation, by addreſſing to the Dr. in the language of the above quoted author to Mr. White, " By the order of your common prayer, " all perſons baptiſed, when they come to compe- " tent years, and are able to ſay the Lord's prayer, " Creed, and ten Commandments, and the anſwers " of the ſhort Catechiſm, are to be brought to con- " firmation". The Biſhop having aſked, " whe- " ther they renew the ſolemn promiſe and vow " which was made in their names in baptiſm", " &c; upon their anſwer, " we do", proceeds " hereupon to declare, in the moſt ſolemn man- " ner, even in an addreſs to God himſelf, " that " he has vouchſafed to *regenerate* theſe his ſervants " by water and the HOLY GHOST, (note: Not " by water only, but alſo by the HOLY GHOST) " and to give them the *forgiveneſs of all their ſins*": " And laying his hand upon each particular per- " ſon, " he CERTIFIES him by that ſign of God's " favor and gracious goodneſs towards him". I " pray you, Sir, in the name of God, inform me, " what warrant has the Biſhop to pronounce a " man's ſins ALL FORGIVEN, and himſelf RE- " GENERATED by the HOLY GHOST, upon no o- " ther grounds than his being able to ſay the ſhort " Catechiſm,

" Catechiſm, and declaring that he ſtands by his " baptiſmal engagements ? Will you ſay that this " is the chriſtian doctrine concerning the terms " of acceptance and forgiveneſs with God ?—Are " there not multitudes who call Chriſt their Lord, " and publicly profeſs to ſtand by their baptiſmal " covenant, whom yet he will reject with abhor- " rence at laſt ? You will then inform me, Sir, " how his Lordſhip, upon this meer profeſſion and " promiſe, preſumes to declare to almighty God, " and to ASSURE the perſon, that he is REGENE- " RATED, FORGIVEN, and without all peradven- " ture in a ſtate of favor with heaven ! The ex- " preſſions, you muſt acknowledge, are couched " in abſolute and ſtrong terms : Nor do I find " that there is any intimation, that their forgive- " neſs depends upon their care to keep, and to " live up to, their baptiſmal engagements. No : " But though their whole life hath hitherto been " ſcandalouſly corrupt ; yet upon their being able " to ſay the Lord's prayer, &c. the Biſhop ſo- " lemnly pronounces a moſt abſolute pardon over " them ; appeals to almighty God that he hath " forgiven them all their ſins ; and leſt this ſhould " be too little to ſatisfie the doubting ſinner, and " quaſh his upbraiding conſcience, he lays his hand " upon his head, and CERTIFIES him, by that ſign, " of God's favor and goodneſs to him.—To me, " Sir, I aſſure you, this appears, I do not ſay a " very ſhocking, but I muſt ſay a very unaccoun- " table ſolemnity ; and ſhould be glad to know " how to reconcile it to the reverence you owe to " God, or to the faithfulneſs and charity due to " the ſouls of men.—Whether the continuance of " this ceremony, in it's preſent form of admini- " ſtration, be either for the honor of the admini-

" ſtrator,

" ſtrator, or for the benefit of the Church ?—
" Whether it hath not an apparent tendency to
" cheriſh a deluſive hope, and to ſpeak peace to
" ſuch perſons as are not, by the chriſtian cove-
" nant, entitled to peace ? I, with all humility,
" leave to the conſideration of thoſe whom, I
" thank God, it more immediately concerns than
" my ſelf; who are to watch for ſouls as thoſe
" who muſt give an account to the GREAT SHEP-
" HERD, who will ſhortly come ; before whom it
" will be a tremendous thing to have the immortal
" ſouls of THOUSANDS required at their hands". *

* Diſſenting Gentleman's anſwer to White, pag. 46, 48, 173.

ANSWER

ANSWER to SECTION III. which declares, the Church in AMERICA, without an Epiſcopate, is neceſſarily deſtitute of a regular Government, and cannot enjoy the Benefits of Ordination and Confirmation.

THE deſign of the Dr. in this Section, is, to ſet before the Public the "wretched condition" of the Epiſcopal Churches in the Colonies "for want of Biſhops". And it's lamentably bad ſtate lies in this, pag. 27. that "if, according to the doctrine and belief of the Church of England, none have a right to govern the Church but Biſhops, nor to ordain, nor to confirm; then the American Church, while without Biſhops, muſt be without Government, without Ordination and Confirmation".

As to confirmation, it is acknowledged, they muſt be in want of it without Biſhops, becauſe they only can perform this piece of ſervice, conformably to the eſtabliſhed order of the Engliſh Church. But this, though a "great grievance", is yet paſſed over without "enlargement", as not being ſuted, I ſuppoſe, to the Colony-taſte, and the other "more important points of Government and Ordination" immediately proceeded to, and diſtinctly

distinctly considered. I shall follow the Dr. in his own way. Only, before I come to take notice of what he has offered upon these "more important" heads, I shall not think it needless to make the two following remarks.

The first relates to these words, pag. 27. "according to the doctrine and belief of the Church of England, NONE have a right to govern the Church but Bishops". It is added, in a marginal note here, "the reader will observe, that only such authority is spoken of as is purely Ecclesiastical, and peculiar to the officers of the Church. The King's supremacy, as expressed in article XXXVII, is maintained by the Church in America, in as full and ample manner as in England". What I would observe here is, the difficulty, I may rather say the impossibility of conceiving how it should be believed, that "NONE but Bishops have a right to govern the Church", while it is, at the same time believed, that the "KING is the supreme Governor of it", according to the article refer'd to, which declares, that he hath the CHIEF POWER, the CHIEF GOVERNMENT in all Ecclesiastical causes. The King's supremacy in the Church means nothing short of this, that he is "vested with all "power to exercise all manner of Ecclesiastical "jurisdiction, and that Arch-Bishops, Bishops, "Arch-Deacons, and other Ecclesiastical persons, "have no manner of jurisdiction Ecclesiastical, but "by and under the King's Majesty, who hath full "power and authority to hear and determine all "manner of causes Ecclesiastical, and to reform "and correct all vice, sin, errors, heresies, enor-"mities, abuses whatsoever, which by any manner "of spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought, or "may

" may be lawfully reformed". * Biſhops therefore, are ſo far from being " the ONLY Governors of the Church", that they are nothing more than ſubordinate rulers, dependent on the King, who, by their own acknowledgement, is placed over them as their SUPREME head. The plain truth is, as to authority, " purely Eccleſiaſtical", there is no ſuch thing in the Church of England. Whatever authority it's Clergy, whether ſuperior or inferior, are veſted with, it is, in all it's branches, both granted and regulated by the ſtate, and abſolutely under it's controul; inſomuch, that, be their ſpiritual powers as you pleaſe, they have no right, by the conſtitution of the Church, to put them into exerciſe, but in the preciſe way that has been preſcribed to them; nor can they do it in any one inſtance. No Biſhop in England, not all the Biſhops united in a body, with all that plenitude of power that has been derived to them in a direct line from the Apoſtles, have a conſtitutional right to make the leaſt alteration in the eſtabliſhed form of worſhip, ordination, or diſcipline. They are

H reſtrained

* Diſſent. Gentleman's anſwer to Mr. White, pag. 24. in which he refers to 26th Henry VIII. cap. 137.—Henry VIII. cap. xvii. 1 Eliz. cap. 1. See alſo Burn, on Eccleſiaſtical law, under the word, *Supremacy*; where the ſeveral acts of Parliament, relative to this ſubject, in the reigns of Henry 8th, Edward 6th, Elizabeth, and William and Mary, are cited; where likewiſe it will be found, " that no perſon ſhall be received into the miniſtry, nor admitted to any Eccleſiaſtical function, except he ſhall firſt ſubſcribe (among others) to this article following; " that the King's Majeſty under God is the ONLY SUPREME GOVERNOR of this realm, and of all other his Highneſſes's dominions and countries, as well in ALL SPIRITUAL or ECCLESIASTICAL things, as temporal".——

reſtrained within certain bounds, beyond which they have no authority, and can no more exerciſe it than any common Layman. This is the "doctrine and belief of the Church of England"; and yet, according to the doctrine and belief of this ſame Church, as the Dr. ſays, "NONE have a right to govern it but Biſhops". He may, perhaps, find it difficult, upon tryal, to make both parts of this contradiction true. The ſhort of the caſe is, Biſhops, with the whole Church-Clergy, are CREATURES of the ſtate, and the Church itſelf a PARLIAMENTARY Church. The diſſenting gentleman, in his anſwer to Mr. White, has ſet this matter in a ſtrong point of light. Says he, * "You "need not be informed, Sir, that all the Clergy "of this Kingdom, with all the Biſhops at their "head, have not the leaſt authority to enjoin one "ceremony or rite of worſhip; or to either eſta-"bliſh or annul one article of faith. No, but all "power and juriſdiction is lodged chiefly in Lay-"hands; it is ſolely in the KING and PARLIA-"MENT, and the Clergy are to act in all things "under their direction and controul. The KING "and PARLIAMENT are in truth the real Fathers, "Governors, or Biſhops of this Church: Theſe "only have power to make or unmake forms and "rites of worſhip, and do AUTHORITATIVELY "inſtruct and preſcribe to the Clergy what they "are to believe—in what manner, and to whom "the ſacraments are to be given—what prayers "they are to offer up—what doctrine to preach—"who are to be admitted to the Epiſcopate or "Prieſthood, and who to be refuſed—by what "ceremonies, prayers, and exhortations they are "to be ſet apart, and conſecrated to their office.—"Theſe, with every other circumſtance relating to "religion

* Pag. 9, 10.

" religion and the worſhip of God, which is AUTHORITATIVELY preſcribed or enjoined in your " Church, you know, Sir, not the Biſhops and " Clergy, but the KING with his PARLIAMENT, " are the ONLY perſons who have AUTHORITATIVELY enjoined and preſcribed them. The " Clergy of the whole land, in convocation aſſembled, cannot ſo much as attempt any canons or " conſtitutions without the KING's *licence*,—yea, " ſo far Sir, were the Biſhops and Clergy from " having any hand in the firſt forming our preſent " eſtabliſhed Church, or in ordering it's rites and " articles of faith, that it was done not only WITHOUT, but in actual OPPOSITION to them. For " in the 1ſt of Queen Eliſabeth, the PARLIAMENT " ALONE eſtabliſhed the Queen's ſupremacy, and " the Common-prayer-book, in ſpite of all oppoſition from the Biſhops in the houſe of Lords; " and the Convocation, then ſitting, were ſo far " from having any hand in thoſe Church-acts " for reformation, that they preſented to the Parliament ſeveral propoſitions in behalf of the " Tenets of POPERY, directly contrary to the proceedings of the Parliament. Hence, Sir, I think " you muſt be abſolutely forced to own (what I " know gentlemen of your robe do not care to " hear) that the Church of England is really a " PARLIAMENTARY Church; that it is not properly an ALLY, but a MERE CREATURE of the " ſtate. It depends intirely upon the acts and " authority of PARLIAMENT for it's very eſſence " and frame".

THE other remark, though not eſſentially important, may yet be worthy of notice. It's deſign is to point out a great and manifeſt difference be-

twixt the complaint as made at the head of this Section, and in the paragraph ſome words of which we have been conſidering, and it's vindication afterwards. The ground of complaint, as there ſpecified, is this, the Church of England in America, being without Biſhops, muſt, for that reaſon, "be without government and ordination": Whereas, the juſtification of this complaint does not proceed upon the ſuppoſition, either that they have "no government", or can have "no ordination"; but that their government without Biſhops is incomplete and inſufficient, and that ordination cannot be had without difficulty, danger and expence. No government, and that which is incomplete; no ordination, and ordination with inconvenience and charge, are quite different things. The complaint therefore ſhould not have been made in abſolute terms, as it's illuſtration is attempted in a reſtained mitigated ſenſe only. There would not then have been a diſagreement betwixt them, as there certainly is as they now ſtand. Let it be remembered, it is only in the reſtrained ſenſe of this complaint that I am called to conſider it. Having obſerved theſe things, the way is prepared to go on.

The Dr. begins with the affair of "Government", and ſays, "It is to be underſtood in a qua-"lified ſenſe. For where there is abſolutely no "government at all, there can be nothing but "diſorder and confuſion; which, I truſt, is not "yet the caſe of the Church in America". The Church then, by this "qualified ſenſe", mitigating it's diſtreſs, is not in that "wretched condition", one was led to imagine when it was ſaid, "while without Biſhops it muſt be without Government".

In

It follows in the next paragraph, " It has been " allowed, that Preſbyters may have a ſubordinate " authority to govern ; and it is well known, that " the Biſhop of London hath formerly taken ſome " cognizance of Eccleſiaſtical matters in the Plan- " tations, by virtue of the King's commiſſion". If Preſbyters may act " authoratatively", in matters of government, though their authority ſhould be " ſubordinate", the Church is in a ſtill leſs deplorable ſtate than was repreſented by the complaint, as at firſt worded ; eſpecially, if the Biſhop of London may " take cognizance of their Eccleſiaſtical matters". And it is evident he may, becauſe he has. That which has been may be again. But ſays the Dr. " much more than this is needful to anſwer the neceſſities of the American Church. The Clergy can evidently do but little without a Biſhop". * And he might have added, they

* The Dr. in a marginal note here, having hinted that there had been voluntary conventions of the Clergy in ſome of the Northern Colonies for a number of years, this being the moſt they could do to relieve the Church in the preſent ſtate of things, ſays, " Indeed ſuch conventions of the Clergy, wherein all the members meet together on terms of equality, are unknown to the Church of England". And they are equally unknown upon terms of inequality, at leaſt to act authoritatively as a body, in order to change, or amend any one order of the Church, or to make a new one. It would not therefore be of any ſervice to have a Biſhop at the head of the American conventions of the Clergy. If nothing more is intended by theſe conventions than to encourage and help one another, and unite their counſels for the good of the Church, conformably to it's laws and canons, there is no need of a Biſhop at their head : If their deſign is to act as a body in an authoritative way, the conſtitution of the Church forbids it. As to what follows,

they can do but little with him, in point of diſcipline. The Church at home is, in this reſpect, in as lamentable a ſtate as the Church in America, and it's "neceſſities" as loudly call for redreſs. The Liturgy itſelf ſuppoſes their diſcipline to be in a wretched condition. Why elſe is the Church taught, once a year, on Aſh-Wedneſday, "to wiſh it's godly diſcipline reſtored"? But, notwithſtanding it's pious wiſhes, annually repeated, it remains ſtill in a deplorably bad ſtate, Epiſcopalians themſelves being judges. Says the learned Dr Whitby, * "The Church of England obſerves no diſcipline". The excellent Biſhop Burnet, at the cloſe of his hiſtory of the reformation notes, † "There was one thing [we could heartily wiſh "there were no more] yet wanting to compleat "the reformation of this Church, which was the "reſtoring a primitive diſcipline againſt ſcanda-"lous perſons; the eſtabliſhing the government "of the Church in Eccleſiaſtical-hands, and taking "it

follows, "that for ſuch a number of Preſbyters to be left without a Biſhop at their head to ſuper-intend and govern them, it is a thing equally unknown to any Epiſcopal Church on earth"; it may be ſaid, there is ſcarce an Epiſcopal proteſtant Church on the earth beſides the Engliſh one: and this no more allows Preſbyters with a Biſhop at their head, than by themſelves alone, to do any thing authoritatively as a body. It is well known, there cannot be a convocation without the King's writ; nor can they when met do any thing without the King's licence; nor will any doing of their's be of binding force unleſs the King confirms it. I do not ſuppoſe theſe conventions of the Clergy are unfavorably thought of at Home. None here object againſt them.

* Vid. his note on Rom. 14. 6. † Dr. Calamy's defence of Mod. Non-conformity, Part II. pag. 340.

" it out of Lay-hands, which have ſo long pro-
" phaned it, and have expoſed the authority of the
" Church, and the cenſures of it, chiefly excom-
" munication, to the contempt of the nation; by
" which the reverence due to holy things is, in ſo
" great a meaſure, loſt, and the dreadfulleſt of all
" cenſures is now become the moſt ſcorned
" and deſpiſed". I ſhall add here the complaint of a noted high Church-writer upon this head. " Diſcipline, ſays he, * is loſt, and will not be per-
" mitted by the ſtate; which, by virtue of *conge*
" *d' Eſlire*'s, *Quare impedits*, *prohibitions*, &c. have
" made themſelves the ſole and ultimate judges,
" not only of all Biſhops and Churches; but of
" their excommunications, and every exerciſe of
" their ſpiritual juriſdiction". The plain truth is, the conſtitution of the Church, at leaſt in the affair of diſcipline, is in a miſerably defective, if not ruined, ſtate. It greatly wants amendment; and unleſs it ſhould vaſtly differ in America from what it is in England, Biſhops would be of little ſervice with reſpect to diſcipline. The Church may, perhaps, do as well without them, as with them.

The Dr. ſays farther, " Tryal has heretofore been made what could be done by commiſſaries".— And why might not commiſſaries ſupply the place of Biſhops, at leaſt in regard of diſcipline? Perhaps, it will be found, upon examination, that Biſhops can do little more than they might be able to do. " But their uſefulneſs (as it follows) upon the whole appeared to be ſo inconſiderable, that none have been appointed for near twenty years". Poſſibly, the reaſon of their not being uſeful was owing, not to the uſeleſſneſs of the office itſelf, but to

* Caſe of the Regal. and Pontif. pag. 165.

to it's not being filled with thoſe who were duly qualified for it. This, I believe, is the exact truth with reference to the laſt commiſſary the Church had in theſe parts, and I know not but the only one it ever had. He was a native of England, and ſent from thence an utter ſtranger to the people here. The Biſhop of London could not therefore be impoſed on by "ample credentials", relative to his character, from this part of the world. And yet, he was ſo far from being ſuperior to his brethren, that ſome of them, I know, would have tho't it a diſhonor to be compared with him. Something of his juſt merit may be learned from the affair of Hopkington, as publiſhed by Dr. Mayhew, in one of his pieces on the diſpute about the conduct of the Society for the propagation of the Goſpel in foreign parts. If no more care is taken as to the perſonal qualifications of Biſhops, ſhould they be ſent, I will venture to propheſie, that, in leſs than twenty years, even the Epiſcopal-Clergy themſelves will be heartily ſick of them.

The Dr. pag. 30. divides the government of the Church into "two branches", taking in both "the Clergy, and the Laity". But, before he comes to apply this diviſion to the caſe of the American Church, he interpoſes a few things which muſt not paſs unnoticed.

Says he, pag. ibid. "What the juſt penalties "of obedience are, we muſt learn from the nature "of the Church itſelf.—The power of the Church "is of a ſpiritual nature, and the utmoſt effect of "it, in this world, is the cutting off and rejecting "thoſe members which are incurably and dangerouſly corrupted".——This is certainly true of the

the Church, conſidered, in it's proper ſenſe, as "a kingdom that is not of this world". But it is really aſtoniſhing, that he ſhould make ſpiritual cenſures the utmoſt effect of the power of the Church of England. He muſt be very ignorant, if he did not know, that an "excommunicated member is "delivered over to the civil arm to humble and "chaſtiſe him; is diſabled from aſſerting his na-"tural rights, from being a witneſs, from bring-"ing actions at law, and, if he does not ſubmit in "forty days, a writ ſhall iſſue forth to impriſon "him". * It follows, "Excommunication, how-ever it was dreaded in the pureſt ages of Chriſti-anity, has loſt much of it's force in this; wherein Altars are ſet up againſt Altars, and Churches a-gainſt Churches, and thoſe who are rejected by one may be received by another". I cannot affirm, that the Church of England in the Colonies have not admitted thoſe to the Goſpel-privileges from among us, whoſe moral conduct was an hindrance to their being admitted to them in our Churches; but this I will ſay, on the contrary, that no one, in like circumſtances, was ever received from Epiſ-copal Churches into any of our's; and I dare ven-ture to engage, that this will never happen, unleſs we ſhould become corrupt to a degree far beyond what has ever yet been our caſe. The Dr. goes on, "a diſpoſition to ſlight the higheſt puniſhment "which the Church can inflict has become gene-"ral, and there appears to be no remedy for it, "unleſs in the uſe of reaſon and perſuaſion. But "we live in an age, in which the voice of reaſon "will not be heard, although ſupported by the de-"clarations of heaven, on the ſubject of Church-

* Diſſent. Gent. anſw. to Mr. White, pag. 22.

" diſcipline. Nay, a man would be generally e-
" ſteemed to be either wrong-headed, or mean-
" ſpirited, or both, who ſhould profeſs much re-
" verence for Eccleſiaſtical authority; and the
" charge of *Prieſt-craft*, ſo long hackneyed by
" infidels and libertines, would be ſure to fall
" upon the Clergy, ſhould they have courage to
" ſpeak up for it". It is readily acknowledged, the diſcipline of the Church is held in contempt by multitudes. Infidels and Libertines laugh to ſee how it is exerciſed, while ſerious good people are pained at heart. And it would, in truth, be a ſhame for a man to ſpeak in it's defence: But whoſe fault is this? If ſo ſacred a matter as the diſcipline of Chriſt is managed by the Church in a contemptible manner, and is permitted to be ſo, year after year, without any attempt for redreſs, why ſhould it be thought ſtrange, if Libertines treat it with ſneer and ridicule? This is no other than might reaſonably be expected. Juſt occaſion is given for it. You know, Sir, to uſe here the words of the diſſenting Gentleman, * that " ſome
" of the moſt ſacred acts of ſpiritual juriſdiction,
" it's ſolemn *cenſures* and *excommunications* are
" exerciſed in the Church of England by
" unconſecrated and meer Laymen. Theſe hold
" the *Keys*, open or ſhut, caſt out or admit to it,
" according to their ſole pleaſure. The *Chancel-*
" *lors*, *Officials*, *Surrogates*, who adminiſter the ju-
" riſdiction of ſpiritual Courts, and determine the
" moſt important ſpiritual matters, ſuch as *deliver-*
" *ing men to the devil*, &c. frequently are, and, by
" expreſs proviſion of law, *always* may be Laymen.
" And truly, Sir, I greatly pity you Gentlemen of
" the Clergy, that ſome of the moſt tremendous and
" ſolemn

* Vid. pag. 21, 22.

" ſolemn parts of your ſacred office, ſuch as *Ex-*
" *communications*, *Abſolutions*, &c. you are *forced* to
" perform, not only according to, but ſometimes,
" perhaps, directly againſt your own judgments,
" as you are *authoritatively* directed and command-
" ed by theſe Lay-perſons. *Forced*, I ſay, to do
" it, notwithſtanding what you urge about *your*
" *own concurrence* ; for if you refuſe to concur,
" you are immediately liable to *ſuſpenſion ab officio*
" *et beneficio* ; and if you continue obſtinate, to be
" excommunicated your own ſelves". You know alſo, that in the Church of England ſpiritual cenſures may be bought off with money, or exchanged for it. " May not, ſays the diſſenting Gentle-
" man,* a grievous ſinner, according to her conſti-
" tution, be ſuffered to COMMUTE ? To have par-
" don for money, and to ſkreen himſelf by a round
" fee from the ſtroke of the Church's rod ? Yea,
" when he is going to be delivered, or actually is
" delivered, into the hands of the devil, and ſatan
" has him in keeping, will not an *handſome ſum*
" preſently pluck him thence, and reſtore him to
" the Church's ſoft and indulgent boſom again" ? What a mockery of religion is this ! How prophane an abuſe of the diſcipline Chriſt has inſtituted ! " Thy money periſh with thee", ſaid the apoſtle Peter, upon a like occaſion. This moſt ſcandalous practice can be juſtified, neither by the ſcripture, nor primitive antiquity. There is not a word to be found in either of this prophane commutation.—You cannot but know farther, what is ſtill, if poſſible, more ſhameful, that the vileſt ſinners are ſuffered, in your Church, to partake of the ſymbols of Chriſt's body and blood. Says one of the

* Pag. 21.

beſt and ſtrongeſt writers againſt the Church, * " are not ſome of the moſt prophane and aban- " doned of men, Rakes, Debauchees, Blaſphemers " of God, and Scoffers at all religion, often ſeen " upon their knees around *your communion-table*, " eating the children's bread, and partaking of the " holy elements to qualifie for a *Poſt ?* Dare your " miniſters refuſe them ! No, they dare not refuſe " the *moſt impious blaſphemer* the three kingdoms " afford, when he comes to demand it as a quali- " fication for an office in the Army or Fleet. And " if, in any other caſe, the Prieſt denies the ſacra- " ment to the moſt *infamous* ſinner dwelling in his " Pariſh, if the man, upon an appeal to the Eccle- " ſiaſtical court, can ſecure the favor of the *Lay-* " *Chancellor*, he may ſecurely defy both the mini- " ſter and the Biſhop to keep him from the Lord's " table. The Chancellor's determination ſhall ſtand " in law, though CONTRARY TO THE BISHOP'S; " and the miniſter be liable to a ſuſpenſion for re- " fuſing compliance ; and if he is contumacious, " and will not give the man the ſacrament, even " to excommunication itſelf". As this is the real ſtate of the Church of England's diſcipline, it is no wonder "a man would be eſteemed wrong- headed, if he ſhould profeſs much reverence for it". Inſtead of revering "Eccleſiaſtical authority", as exerciſed in the eſtabliſhed Church, it ought rather to be lamented over as giving but too juſt occaſion for it's being ſlighted and condemned.

THE Dr. now comes to the point in hand, the diſcipline of the Church under an American Epiſco- pate. And he enters upon it with a frank, honeſt acknowledgment, though it totally ſubverts all that he

* Diſſent. Gent. pag. 69.

he has afterwards said. His words are, * " In this state of things, the restoration of the primitive discipline seems to be a matter rather to be wished for and desired, than to be RATIONALLY ATTEMPTED by those in authority". And yet, it is proposed, that this very thing, which cannot RATIONALLY BE ATTEMPTED", should not only be attempted, but carried into effect. It is said indeed, " no attempt of this nature will be made respecting the LAITY, under an American Episcopate. The discipline of the Church, so far as it relates to the PRIVATE MEMBERS, will be left as it is".—But then, it is added, " with regard to the CLERGY, it is proposed, that a strict discipline be established, and that the Bishop's power over them shall be as full and complete, as the laws and canons of the Church direct". But why should the discipline, directed to by the laws of the Church, be confined to the Clergy, while the Laity are left without restraint ? Judge ye that constitute the Public, whether this is reasonable ? Whether it consists, in any tolerable measure, with the Gospel-institution of discipline ? Is not godly discipline as needful for the Laity as the Clergy ? Are the Church-Clergy so much worse than the Laity, that the latter may be left to themselves, while " a strict discipline shall be established for the former ? What would the Dr. have the world think of the Episcopal-Clergy, by placing them in so unfavorable a light ? Besides, are not Bishops, as successors to the Apostles, as much vested with authority to govern the Laity as the Clergy ? And why should their apostolic authority be thus limited by a meerly human establishment ? Especially, as the Dr. himself † makes it one main article of his complaint, that " the PEOPLE,

* Pag. 31. † Pag. 29.

PEOPLE, being sensible of the Clergy's want of power, without an Ecclesiastical superior, find themselves free from all restraints of Ecclesiastical authority" ; intimating the expediency of their being " governed by those who have proper authority, and that, without this, the body is without strength, and liable to be destroyed". It is really surprising, when Bishops are pleaded for as NECESSARY in order to discipline, that they should not be suffered to exercise it, in so important a branch as that of the government of the Laity ! One would not have expected such a proposal from Episcopal Clergymen.

PERHAPS, it will be said, the lamentable state of the Church's discipline respects the Laity only. It would therefore be in vain to attempt it's restoration in regard of them ; though it may reasonably be attempted with respect to the Clergy. But this is a meer pretence. If there is any force in the argument taken from the wretched condition of the Church's discipline, it is equally strong against it's being established for the government of either. For it is equally lame, lax, and ineffectual respecting both. It's ruined state, in regard of the Laity, has been already pointed out. I would now say, notwithstanding all the godly discipline of the English Church, many ignorant, loose, vicious men, are vested with the Priest's office, and permitted to act in it. The Public is called upon to attend to a few words, from the excellent Bishop Burnet, relative to the Church-Clergy. They are introduced in this solemn manner, * " I am now in the " 70th year of my age, and as I cannot speak long " to the world in any sort, so I cannot hope for a " more

* Preface to his Pastoral Care, pag. 24.

" more ſolemn occaſion than this of ſpeaking with " all due freedom, both to the preſent and ſuc- " ceeding ages : Therefore I lay hold on it to give " a free vent to thoſe ſad thoughts that lie on my " mind both day and night, and are the ſubject of " many ſecret mournings. I dare appeal to that " God, to whom the ſecrets of my heart are known, " to whom I am ſhortly to give an account of my " miniſtry, that I have the true intereſts of this " Church before my eyes, and that I purſue them " with a ſincere and fervent zeal".—The words themſelves I would bring to view are as follow, * " Our *Ember weeks* are the burden and grief of my " life. The *much greater part* of thoſe who come " to be ordained are ignorant to a degree not to be " apprehended by thoſe, who are not obliged to " know it. The eaſieſt part of knowledge is that " to which they are the greateſt ſtrangers ; I mean " the plaineſt parts of the ſcriptures, which they " ſay, in excuſe of their ignorance, that their tutors " in the Univerſities never mention the reading of " to them ; ſo that they can give no account, or " at leaſt a very imperfect one, of the contents e- " ven of the Goſpels. Thoſe who have read ſome " few books, yet ſeem never to have read the ſcrip- " tures. Many cannot give a tolerable account " even of the Catechiſm itſelf, how ſhort and plain " ſoever. They cry, and think it a ſad diſgrace to " be denied orders, though the ignorance of ſome " is ſuch, that, in a well regulated ſtate of things, " they would appear not knowing enough to be " admitted to the holy ſacrament. This does often " tear my heart. The caſe is not much better in " many, who, having got into orders, come for " inſtitution, and cannot make it appear, that they " have

* Pag. 25, 26.

" have read the ſcriptures, or any one good book,
" ſince they were ordained ; ſo that the ſmall mea-
" ſure of knowledge upon which they get into holy
" orders, not being improved, is in a way to be
" quite loſt ; and then they think it a great hard-
" ſhip if they are told, they muſt know the ſcrip-
" tures, and the body of divinity better, before
" they can be truſted with the care of ſouls. Theſe
" things pierce one's ſoul, and make him often cry
" out, *Oh that I had wings like a dove, for then*
" *would I fly away, and be at reſt !* What are we
" like to grow to ? In what a caſe are we to deal
" with any adverſary, Atheiſt, Papiſt, or Diſſenters,
" or in any ſort to promote the honor of God, and
" carry on the great concerns of the Goſpel, when
" ſo groſs an ignorance in the fundamentals of re-
" ligion has ſpread itſelf ſo much among thoſe who
" ought to teach others, and yet need that one
" *teach them the firſt principles of the oracles of God*".
This ſame pious and learned Biſhop has alſo given us the ſentiments of Arch-Biſhop Leighton upon this head in the following words, " He looked on the ſtate the Church of England was in with very melancholy reflections, and was very uneaſie at an expreſſion then much uſed, that it was the beſt conſtituted Church in the world. He thought it was ſo with relation to the doctrine, the worſhip, and the main part of our government. But, as to the adminiſtration, both with relation to the Eccleſiaſtical Courts, and the Paſtoral care, he looked on it as one of the moſt corrupt he had ever ſeen. He thought we looked like a fair carcaſe of a body, without a ſpirit, without that zeal, that ſtrictneſs of life, and that laborioufneſs in the Clergy that became us. * To the like purpoſe the excellent Mr.

* Hiſtory of his own Time, pag. 432. Vol. II.

Mr. Pierce complains upon this head. "The "Parishoners, says he, * in a very few places have "that power, which, CYPRIAN says, belongs "chiefly to the people, of CHUSING WORTHY "PRIESTS, OR REFUSING THOSE THAT ARE UN-"WORTHY. If a Rector is to be placed in a "Parish, the Patron of the living writes a letter to "the Bishop, and recommends whatClergyman he "pleases to be put into it. The Bishop cannot re-"fuse the person thus recommended; and so the "Parishoners, whether they will or no, are com-"mitted to the care of that Presbyter, chosen by a "stranger, and, it may be, a notoriously wicked "person. It might, perhaps, seem incredible a-"broad, if I should assert, that, in the Church of "England, the best reformed Church, as they "themselves boast, in the world,— the right of "Patronage is bought and sold; and that it is not "reckoned simony, nor any crime at all, for a per-"son to buy that right, or the next presentation "of a living, provided it be not void at the time. "Hence ignorant fellows,if they are but rich, often "get the fattest benefices. And when they have "got the livings,they are not bound to take care of "the flock themselves; it is enough if they leave "so troublesome a work to any sorry Curate, who "will do it cheapest. Nay, sometimes the mini-"ster shall have the income of two, three, or more "parishes, who will not vouchsafe to take the "pastoral care of one". He adds from Bishop Burnet, "what can we say, when we find often the "poorest clerks in the richest livings? Whose in-"cumbents, not content to devour the parsimony "of the Church, while they *feed themselves, and not* "*the flock* out of it, are so scandalously hard in their

* Vind. of Dissent. pag. 562.

" allowance to their Curates, as if they intend-
" ed equally to ſtarve both curate and peo-
" ple". Mr. Pierce obſerves yet farther, " they
" who have procured themſelves benefices may, in
" a manner, live as they pleaſe. Several of our
" preſent Biſhops, of eminent learning and piety,
" who would be glad to proceed againſt vicious
" Clergy-men, and turn them out of their livings,
" find themſelves hindered by our laws from doing
" it. Hence our nation abounds with diſſolute
" Clergy-men, the ſhame of their Country, and
" the holy function". I may ſubjoin to what has been offered from the above writers, that a very great part of the Epiſcopal-Clergy are only Curates, meer Underlings, hired to do the work which, in all reaſon and conſcience, ought to be done by others; and at ſo low a rate too, that, notwithſtanding the riches of the Church, they are, many of them, by reaſon of their poverty, made " contemptible and baſe before all the people".

THUS miſerably lax is the Church's diſcipline reſpecting the Clergy; and it's method of adminiſtration is ſuch, that, while this continues, it will be as vain a thing to attempt a reform in regard of the Clergy, as the Laity. The government of the former is in as ill a ſtate, as the government of the latter; and this, notwithſtanding they have ſo many Biſhops at their head, ſuper-intending and directing their conduct: And no wonder, as the affair of diſcipline is in the hands of Chancellors, rather than Biſhops. Says the Biſhop of Hereford, *
" If there be any thing in the office of a Biſhop to
" be challenged peculiar to themſelves, certainly
" it ſhould be this, (excommunication) yet this is
" in

* Naked Truth, pag. 58.

" in a manner quite relinquiſhed to their Chancel-
" lors, Laymen, who have no more capacity to
" ſentence or abſolve a ſinner, than to diſſolve the
" heavens or the earth.—The Chancellor takes
" upon him to ſentence not only Laymen, but
" Clergymen alſo brought into his court for any
" delinquency. And in the court of Arches, they
" ſentence even Biſhops themſelves".—He adds,
" I remember when the Biſhop of Wells, hearing
" of a cauſe corruptly managed, and coming into
" court to rectifie it, the Chancellor Dr. Duck,
" fairly and mannerly bid him be gone, for he
" had no power to act any thing; and there-
" withall pulled out his Patent, ſealed by this
" Biſhop's Predeceſſor, which frightened the poor
" Biſhop out of the court".——The eſtabliſhment of diſcipline here muſt therefore be different from what it is at home, or it will be as truly incomplete with a Biſhop at the head of the Clergy, as it is at preſent without one; and as inſufficient for their government, as the government of the Laity.

The Dr. goes on to repreſent the neceſſity of eſtabliſhing a ſtrict diſcipline in regard of the Clergy. But what he has offered is far leſs weighty than one would have expected in an affair he ſeems to lay ſo great ſtreſs upon. He conſiders the Church-Clergy as either *virtuous* or *vicious*, and, in either caſe, ſays, " the want of Biſhops to ſuper-intend and govern them, is obvious at firſt view".

Says he, in caſe of their being virtuous, " if
" they have NO NEED of a Biſhop to keep them to
" their duty, yet ſome caſes will ariſe, in which his
" direction will be uſeful—and many caſes, where-
" in his ſupport and encouragement will be need-

" ful—and in all caſes, his friendſhip and patronage " will give life and ſpirit to them in undergoing " the difficulties, and in performing the duties, of " their function". But what is all this to the affair of DISCIPLINE, the grand point in view? The Dr's buſineſs here was, to ſhew it to be NECESSARY that STRICT DISCIPLINE ſhould be eſtabliſhed with reſpect to the Clergy; and he begins his argument with a caſe, wherein it is NOT NEEDED AT ALL. Is this pertinent to the propoſed ſubject of debate? Might he not as well have left out what he has here ſaid, as being little to the purpoſe? Beſides, the advantange here repreſented by the miſſion of a Biſhop is rather imaginary, than real. Was there now a Biſhop in whatever part of America he would chuſe, the Clergy would notwithſtanding be variouſly diſtant from him ſome hundreds of miles; inſomuch that but few of them could reap much benefit either by his direction, encouragement, or patronage; very little more, and with very little leſs difficulty, than if he was in England.

As to the Clergy of a vicious character, the Dr. goes on to ſay, " it is more immediately neceſſary, on account of theſe, that Epiſcopal Government ſhould take place in America" And why? The following conſiderations are mentioned.

" THE proceſs of carrying on an accuſation, and afterwards of ſupporting it, at ſo great a diſtance, muſt be tedious and difficult, and, in ſome caſes, may cauſe thoſe to eſcape puniſhment who really deſerve it". Is not this a juſt repreſentation of a proceſs at home, though there are Biſhops there, and the caſe may be carried on without a plea for delay

delay on account of this "great diſtance"? Have not multitudes "eſcaped puniſhment" by this means, who richly deſerved it? And is not this the very reaſon that Epiſcopalians themſelves, as well as Diſſenters, have often given, why there ſhould be a reform of the adminiſtration of diſcipline in the Engliſh Church? Have they not long complained of the difficulty, tediouſneſs and expence, occaſioned by the SPIRITUAL COURTS, and their management by Lay-chancellors? And this would be the complaint here, notwithſtanding the preſence of a Biſhop. The Dr. indeed ſays, "the caſe would be different under an Epiſcopate; as then for any grievance of this nature, the Church would have an eaſie and effectual remedy". Has not the Church this "eaſie and effectual remedy" at home, under the government of Biſhops? And yet, this grievance continues, and there is no proſpect, at preſent, of it's being removed. And the caſe would probably be much the ſame here, unleſs the eſtabliſhed mode of diſcipline ſhould be ſo changed, as to be quite different from what it is in England. But, if an alteration is to be made, it is infinitely reaſonable, it ſhould firſt take place at home, where it is moſt needed. When it is effected there, it will be time enough to deſire it here.

ANOTHER conſideration the Dr. mentions is, "if a Clergyman ſhall diſgrace his profeſſion in an open and ſcandalous manner, a Biſhop reſiding in the Country might ſuſpend him immediately". Why don't the Biſhops do it at home, as ſcandalous Clergymen are not uncommon there? Beſides, Commiſſaries might be veſted with the power of ſuſpenſion; and it is poſſible thoſe might be found, who would exerciſe this power with as much wiſdom, impartiality and faithfulneſs, as Biſhops.

IT

It is added, " and if, upon tryal, the caſe ſhould be found to deſerve it, he can proceed to deprive him of his benefice, and not only ſilence and deprive him, but excommunicate him from the ſociety of Chriſtians". Obſerve, the caſe muſt be TRIED before the ſuſpended Clergy-man can be deprived, ſilenced and excommunicated. But where is this caſe to be tried? Can it be tried any where, conformably to the mode of the eſtabliſhed Church, but in a SPIRITUAL COURT? To this court it belongs to hear the caſe, and, if it appears proper, to order the ſentence of deprivation, or excommunication. It can be done by this court only; and, ſhould the ſuſpended Clergy-man be able to procure the Chancellor's judgment in his favor, he need not fear the whole power of the Biſhop, ſhould it be exerted againſt him. Now, this ſpiritual court muſt be erected here, or the caſe muſt be carried home to ſome court there. If it is to be carried and ſupported at home, the complaint of " tediouſneſs and difficulty" will remain in full force. If a court is erected here, it muſt be quite changed from what it is in England, or there will be ſtill tedious difficuly, and great expence; inſomuch that, I doubt not, Epiſcopalians themſelves would ſoon be as earneſt in their deſires to be delivered from it, as they now are to have Biſhops.

It is obſerved ſtill farther, " the Clergy's being under the eye of their Biſhop will naturally tend to make them, in general, more regular and diligent in the diſcharge of the duties of their office". If their being under the eye of the omnipreſent, omniſcient God, will not make them regular and diligent, it is a vain thing to expect that their being under " the eye of their Biſhop" ſhould do it.

It

It certainly has not this effect at home; and it is not probable this would be the effect here. Beſides, it muſt be by the help of a very ſtrong figure that they can be ſaid to be under "their Biſhop's eye, ſo as to be much influenced by this conſideration, when, by far the greater part of them, are fixed in cures, ſome fifty, ſome an hundred, and ſome two or three hundred miles from him; as they muſt continue to be in America, unleſs the Church here has many more Biſhops than have ever yet been talked of.

In fine, it is ſaid, "of thoſe whoſe characters are juſtly exceptionable, ſome may probably be reformed by a Biſhop; and, as to others, they may be eaſily diſplaced, unleſs it be the fault of the people themſelves" The reformation of vicious Clergy-men is not ſo eaſily effected. The Biſhops at home find this to be a ſad truth. And no good reaſon can be given, why it ſhould be otherwiſe here, though the Clergy had one or more Biſhops at their head to govern them. As to the "diſplacing" unreformed Clergy-men, it has long been complained of in England, as one of the greateſt difficulties; and the difficulty would be much the ſame in America, under the ſame mode of adminiſtring Church-diſcipline; and there can be no other, unleſs the eſtabliſhed conſtitution is departed from. And if it may in one inſtance, it may in another; and ſo on until it has quite loſt it's preſent form.

I have now taken notice of every thing the Dr. has ſaid, in favor of an American-Epiſcopate, upon the head of *diſcipline*, and cannot but think, it will appear, that he has very much failed in what he undertook

undertook to prove. The ſum of what he has offered, and of what has been replied, is this ;— He has honeſtly declared, as " the reſtoration of primitive diſcipline cannot RATIONALLY BE ATTEMPTED, no attempt of this nature will be made in regard of the Laity". And might he not, for the ſame reaſon, in full force, have ſaid, neither will it be attempted with reference to the Clergy ? But though it can NO MORE RATIONALLY BE ATTEMPTED in regard of the one than the other ; yet the eſtabliſhment of ſtrict diſcipline, under an Epiſcopate, is pleaded for in regard of the Clergy, to the intire neglect of the Laity. And why ? Becauſe, if the Church has a Biſhop here, he can " immediately ſuſpend a ſcandalous Clergyman". And might not a Commiſſary do the ſame as well ? And yet, this is all within the reach of a Biſhop's power, in conſiſtency with the Church's conſtitution. For, as to " depriving, ſilencing and excommunicating a ſuppoſed ſcandalous Clergyman, the Biſhop can do neither of them, before TRYAL of the caſe in ſome SPIRITUAL COURT ; in conſequence of which, the Clergyman may be acquitted, and his ſuſpenſion taken off, even in oppoſition to the remonſtrance of the Biſhop himſelf. As to " direction, encouragement, patronage, and reformation, by being under the eye of the Biſhop", they do not belong to the affair of " ſtrict diſcipline" ; ſo that however uſeful a Biſhop might be in theſe reſpects, it is nothing to the purpoſe in that view of the argument it was propoſed to be here conſidered. The Public will now judge between us.

THE Dr. proceeds to the affair of *ordination*, the want of which, he ſays, is " a greater diſadvantage, if

if possible, than the want of a regular Government". And why? For the following reasons.

One is, "the danger of crossing the Atlantic, without which none can be admitted to holy orders". And the danger, in this respect, he represents, "however trifling in it's appearance to some" to have been so formidable "in the apprehension of others, that it has deter'd them from attempting to obtain ordination". He then tells us, "the voyage has proved fatal to near a fifth part of those who have gone for holy orders". I have never heard of more than two to whom the sea proved fatal. If eight more lost their lives by sickness, it is no more than they might have done if they had tarried at home. But be the "danger" great or small, there is good reason to believe, the going to England for ordination is rather an advantage, than disadvantage to the Church in regard of it's being supplied with ministers. As to my self, I should esteem it a happy circumstance in the case, was I inclined to take orders; and many I have mentioned it to have declared themselves to be of the same mind. And, were it proper, I could name some Candidates for the ministry among us, who have been tempted, by professors of the Church to receive Episcopal ordination, with this motive in special, that they would have a FINE OPPORTUNITY TO SEE ENGLAND. It should seem from hence, as though going home for orders may be considered by Episcopalians, either as an advantage, or disadvantage, according to the turn they have in view to serve for the present.

Another reason is, "the expence of the voyage, which cannot be reckoned at less, upon

an average, than one hundred pounds ſterling to each perſon", And this is aggravated by the conſideration, that " the expence muſt generally fall upon ſuch, as, having already expended the greateſt part of their pittance in their education, will find it extremely hard to raiſe a ſufficient ſum for the purpoſe". I candidly ſuppoſe the Dr. had never ſeen, or, if he had, did not remember at the time of writing, the account of the Society, publiſhed in 1706, in which they ſay, pag. 74. " all young Students in thoſe parts (meaning the Colonies) who deſire Epiſcopal ordination, are invited into England ; and their EXPENCES in coming and returning are to be defrayed by the Society". According to this invitation, there is no hardſhip, as to the article of " expence", that can be complained of, unleſs abſurdly, but by the Society themſelves ; and they can have juſt reaſon for complaint, as the money they expend in this way is as properly beſtowed, as in ſupport of the Miſſionaries themſelves.

A FARTHER reaſon is, that, " under theſe diſcouragements, there has always been great difficulty in ſupplying the Church with Clergy-men, and there always muſt be". Several inſtances are mentioned in illuſtration of this, taken from Penſylvania, New-Jerſey, and North-Carolina", where, as " Governor Dobbs informed the Society, in 1764, there were but ſix Clergymen, though there were twenty-nine Pariſhes, and each Pariſh contained a whole County". The Dr. very juſtly obſerves, " other reaſons may have contributed to this want of Clergymen" ; but it is really ſtrange he ſhould ſay, " it has always been principally owing to the great difficulty of obtaining ordination".

If

If this has been ſo "great a difficulty", how comes it to paſs, that the New England-Colonies have all along been, and now are, ſupplied with Miſſionaries; inſomuch, that there are few, if any Churches, but are provided with them? Why ſhould the difficulty be ſo very great in other Provinces, and none at all in the New-England ones, or ſo inconſiderable as to be eaſily got over? If it was in itſelf a real and great difficulty, it's operation would be as powerful in theſe Colonies, as the other. Other cauſes muſt certainly be ſought for, in order to account for this want of a ſupply of miniſters. And it is eaſie to point them out; more eſpecially in regard of "North-Carolina", which is far more ſparingly provided for, than either Penſylvania, or New Jerſey.—The Society has comparatively neglected this Colony, though it's circumſtances moſt importunately called for their pious and charitable care, being deſtitute of the means of ſalvation in a degree that was never known in the more northern parts of America. Theſe, though in as full enjoyment of the worſhip of God, and the inſtituted means of grace, in all their towns and villages, as the people in England, have yet been partakers of the Society's charity in ſuch large meaſures as to incapacitate them from giving ſo full a ſupply of Clergymen to the other Colonies, as perhaps they might have been willing to have done. The view indeed of the Society has been to epiſcopize theſe Colonies, and this they have made their great buſineſs; inſomuch, that ſhould it be accompliſhed, IT WILL THEN HAVE BEEN BROUGHT TO THE HAPPY ISSUE INTENDED, as we are told, in plain words, by the Biſhop of Landaff, in his Society-ſermon February 1767. The Society's capacity of ſupporting Miſſionaries is not inexhauſtable;

upon which account, it is no wonder they cannot provide for ſuch numbers in the more northern Colonies, and ſend a needful ſupply alſo to the ſouthern ones. This, I believe, is, at bottom, the chief reaſon of the want of Miſſionaries in the places complained of.—Another reaſon may be, the want of care in the Church-people to educate their ſons for the miniſtry, owing, I ſuppoſe, to their apprehending they would not, in this way, be ſo well provided for, as they ſhould deſire.—Another reaſon ſtill may be, the inſufficiency of the temptation, in moſt caſes, to influence Candidates among us to go over to the Church. They have a better proſpect in continuing with us, than they would have ſhould they change ſides, and become Epiſcopalians.—I ſhall only add, I never heard the difficulty of obtaining ordination given as a reaſon againſt going for it, by any one in this part of America. And I am perſuaded, it is now mentioned chiefly in a ſpeculative way, as carrying with it a plauſible appearance to thoſe who are ſtrangers to the Country.

It is farther mentioned, as a "more glaring diſadvantage, that it is impoſſible a Biſhop, reſiding in England, ſhould be ſufficiently acquainted with the characters of thoſe who go home from this Country for holy orders". And to this cauſe it is attributed, "that ordination has been ſometimes fraudulently and ſurreptitiouſly obtained by ſuch wretches, as are not only a ſcandal to the Church, but a diſgrace to the human ſpecies". It is ſaid, notwithſtanding the "greateſt care and circum-"ſpection have ſucceſſively been exerciſed by the "Biſhops of London, inſtances have happened, "wherein perſons have produced in England ample "written Credentials of their pious and orderly "converſation,

" converſation, whoſe lives have been notoriouſly " infamous in this Country; and after having been " inveſted with the ſacred office, they have been ſent " back to take the charge of the ſouls of others, in " proſecution of which work, they have acted as if " they had not, or imagined that they had not, any " ſouls of their own". Had ſuch a charge been publicly exhibited againſt the Society's Miſſionaries by thoſe of the Preſbyterian or Congregational perſuſion, it would, however reſpectable they might be for their virtuous integrity, have been diregarded at home, and eſteemed by Epiſcopalians here a ſure argument of inveterate enmity to the Church. But they can themſelves freely ſay that, which, if others had only ſuggeſted, they would have bitterly exclaimed againſt them. There may have been Miſſionaries, whoſe character is here juſtly deſcribed; but, I believe, it would be found, upon examination, that they were natives of England or Ireland, and ſent from home, from whence they muſt have had their ample Credentials, if they had any, and not from this Country. I know of none, who have gone from America, at leaſt this part of it, to whom the above deſcription can be juſtly applicable; nor am I, at preſent, inclined to think, it is ſtrictly true in regard of any of them.

In order to give the matter a ſtill more plauſible appearance, it is ſaid, " in ſuch a Country as America, an artful man may ſometimes be able to procure teſtimonials in his favor, ſigned by a competent number of ſuch Clergymen and others as a Biſhop of London will not know how to object againſt". What there is in " ſuch a Country as this", more than in other Countries, to favor a wicked artful man in procuring ſuch teſtimonials of his pious and

and regular life as "a Biſhop of London would not object againſt", the Dr. has not pointed out, and I am utterly at a loſs to know his meaning here; but it is eaſie to know thus much, that he has ſhamefully reflected on the Epiſcopal-Clergy, by ſaying, that this artful man, whoſe life had been notoriouſly infamous in this Country, might be able to get a "competent number of them" to ſign teſtimonials of his chriſtian good converſation.—Nay, he makes his artful ſeeker of orders infamous to ſo high a degree of guilt, as even to FORGE teſtimonials in his own favor. And to this he attributes "the ſucceſs of ſome adventurers from the Colonies, who have obtained ordination, and then returned to America to diſgrace themſelves, and the Church". It is ſtrange to ſee, when men have an end in view their heart is ſet upon, what lengths they will go in laying thoſe things, which, if laid by others, would be attributed to the powerful influence of imbittered hatred and malice. The Dr. has painted the Miſſionaries, ſome of them at leaſt, in the blackeſt colors. They were never viewed, by the worſt enemies the Church ever had, in a light ſo glaringly bad. It is very much doubted, even by theſe, whether an inſtance can be given of a ſingle perſon, ſo infamouſly vile, as to go from America with FORGED CREDNETIALS, in order to obtain ordination. One there was who came from England with a FORGED LICENCE to preach; and he was as notorious a ſinner as ever prophaned a pulpit; but we never heard, in this part of the world, of any one who *forged* Credentials from hence to come over with orders to officiate as a miniſter.

BUT if it ſhould be ſuppoſed, that the whole of what is here laid is exactly and literally true, might not

not the caſe be the ſame was there a Biſhop in America? The greater part by far of thoſe who would go to him for orders, would be as unknown to him, by reaſon of their great diſtance from his ſeat, as to a Biſhop in England. He muſt therefore depend upon teſtimonials from others, and theſe might be *forged*, or *procured no one knows how*; and there would be little leſs danger of it than there is now. It is certain, many notoriouſly wicked perſons in England, vaſtly more in proportion than in America, have found ways, by *forging* teſtimonials, or by procuring them, to uſe the Dr's phraſe, "God knows how", to get into holy orders; and this, though they are much nearer the ordaining Biſhop, than moſt of thoſe can be, in the Colonies, who may want, and go from them. And the like legerdemain might as eaſily be practiſed here as there. I know of nothing, if it be ſuppoſed that men are abandoned to all ſenſe of God and religion, to hinder it. Beſides, Commiſſaries might as well prevent this miſchief as Biſhops, ſo far as it can be prevented. And a Biſhop of London would be no more in danger of being impoſed upon by ſuch infamous wretches, than a Biſhop in America, if he would give orders to none but ſuch as came recommended by a Commiſſary. In this caſe, one muſt be a fool, or madman, ſhould he forge teſtimonials under his name; becauſe he would immediately be detected upon his returning hither.

Upon the whole, the Dr. appears to have been as deficient in his arguing upon the head of ordination, as diſcipline. He does not pretend, in his reaſoning, that the Church will be deprived of the benefit of ordination, ſhould there be no Biſhop in

in the Colonies. All he goes upon is the "danger and expence" that attend the obtainment of it; and that the Epiſcopal Churches would be in greater danger of having vicious Clergymen obtruded on them. Enough, I truſt, has been ſaid to ſhew, that theſe are pretences, rather plauſible in appearance, than carrying with them real and great weight.

But ſhould the whole of what the Dr. has offered be allowed it's full force, without the leaſt abatement, there is no other hardſhip, or difficulty, in the caſe, than what naturally reſults from profeſſed principles, and muſt unavoidably follow upon them, unleſs an eſtabliſhment is purpoſely made in their favor. The only proper queſtion therefore is, whether ſuch an eſtabliſhment, at ſuch a diſtance from the acknowledged ſupreme head of the Church of England, eſpecially in the preſent ſtate of the American Colonies, may be thought wiſe, expedient, or politic? It appears to us ſuch inconveniences, or rather miſchiefs, will be the attendants on it, as to make it no ways proper or fit. What theſe are ſhall, in it's due place, be particularly mentioned as ſo many reaſons or objections againſt an American Epiſcopate.

ANSWER

ANSWER to SECTION IV. in which the unparalleled Hardſhip of this Caſe is repreſented.

THE Dr. ſeems to think, that he has here a moſt "fruitful ſubject for declamation"; though he declines to "proceed in this way", and has it in deſign to "ſtate arguments and facts for the conſideration of the Public". If he had kept this deſign ſteadily in view, he would have given us leſs declamation, and more reaſoning that was ſolid.

He begins with "making an appeal to the conſciences of men in behalf of the Church". And here, if he had fairly "ſtated the fact", he might eaſily have known, the queſtion he puts could not have been anſwered in his favor, upon an impartial, thorow attention to it. The fact placed in it's true point of light is this. The greater part by far of the Epiſcopal-Churches, in thoſe vaſtly extended, and well inhabited, parts of America, reaching from Penſylvania ſouthward, to Nova-Scotia northward, ſubſiſts chiefly upon the pious help of the Society at home, at the expence, it may be, of three thouſand pounds ſterling per annum;—they cannot have ſuch Biſhops placed at their head as

they would deſire, at a much leſs additional annual expence of pious charity ;—and, leaſt going to England for ordination by a Biſhop, conformably to Epiſcopalian-principles, ſhould be diſcouraging, as it would be attended with charge, the Society has publicly invited into England all young Students in theſe parts, who deſire holy orders ; declaring, THAT THEIR EXPENCE IN COMING AND RETURNING IS TO BE DEFRAYED BY THE SOCIETY. This is the fact juſtly ſtated ; and, in this view of it, I believe, no denomination of chriſtians, under like circumſtances, in his Majeſty's dominions, or in any part of the earth, would think themſelves in the leaſt injured on account of the *expence* attending the obtainment of ordination. Inſtead of crying out " perſecution ! intolerable grievance" ! they would rather, if they had a juſt ſenſe of obligation, feel the bonds of gratitude, and acknowledge they were kindly dealt with. There could be no room, in this caſe, to lament the imaginary hardſhip of " not being allowed a Clergyman without paying a fine of an hundred pounds ſterling on his admiſſion to orders". And as to " the dangerous proceſs that has proved fatal to a fifth part" of thoſe who have entered upon it, it is really ſtrange the Dr. ſhould again bring it to view. It is no other than that common danger which thouſands voluntarily expoſe themſelves to, tho' they have nothing more in proſpect, than the pleaſure of ſeeing foreign Countries. Beſides, this was much more than an ordinary fatality ; and may not happen again for hundreds of years. Surely, the Dr. muſt needs be at a loſs for ſomething weighty to ſay, or he would not have ſo enlarged upon this comparative trifle, and painted it in ſuch hideous colors. And, notwithſtanding this

mighty

mighty grievance, I am verily persuaded, the greater part of those who are desirous of holy orders, was it at their option, would much rather chuse to expose themselves to the danger of going to England to obtain them, than to be put into them here. The gratification of their curiosity, by being in England, and getting aquainted with Gentlemen of worth and learning there, would be a much stronger motive to excite them to go, than the danger of going would be to keep them at home.

The Dr. in a flush of zeal, had spoken of the necessity of going home for orders as "persecution". He seems, upon being a little more cool, to retract that word, as "the grievance in question does not arise from any positive exertion of civil power"; but still, it is "something as bad in it's natural consequences". And, being again suddenly fired, "questions, whether the worst persecutions ever exterminated a fifth part of the Clergy in any Country"; as if accidental misfortunes, men, in all parts of the world, readily run the hazard of, upon motives far less important, than those go upon who desire holy orders, might be compared to a formal persecution designed to exterminate a whole Clergy, though it should take effect upon a fifth part only. The Dr. certainly forgot he intended to argue, or he could not have substituted in the room of it, the meer flight of a warmed imagination.

He goes on in the same extravagant strain, saying, "if there are any points, in which the reason "and common sense of mankind can be supposed "to agree, this must unquestionably be one, that "the Church of England in America, under the "before-mentioned disadvantages, although not

" formally perſecuted, is in a moſt wretched and " deplorable condition". It may, on the contrary, be affirmed as a moſt unqueſtionable truth, and in much better agreement with the common ſenſe of mankind, that the Epiſcopal Churches, in moſt of the Colonies, are favored and diſtinguiſhed far beyond any other Churches of whatever denomination on the Continent, as the moſt of them, in ſuch Colonies, are preſerved in being by a vaſtly expenſive charity; on which account, inſtead of ſighing out groans, they have abundant reaſon for the moſt grateful acknowledgments.

He farther ſpeaks of it as " an aggravation of their unhappineſs, that it appears to be altogether unprecedented; they being ſingled out from all the people upon earth to be made the firſt example of it". If the Church was really in that " wretched deplorable ſtate" he would repreſent, and if it was owing to downright poſitive perſecution, it is unaccountably ſtrange he ſhould mention it as "an unprecedented caſe", and deſcribe the Church as " ſingled out for the firſt example of it". Did he never hear of the infinitely more diſtreſſed condition of great numbers that were deprived, fined, impriſoned, and, in other ways, moſt cruelly dealt with, in the days of thoſe hard-hearted Arch-Biſhops, Parker, Bancroft, Whitegift, and Laud? * Did he never hear of any barbarous

* " Under the firſt of theſe Arch-Biſhops, above an 100; under the ſecond, above 300 pious and learned men, not only members, but miniſters of the Church, were ſilenced, ſuſpended, admoniſhed, deprived, many of them loaded with grievous and heavy fines, and ſhut up in filthy Jails, where they expired ſlowly through penury and

barous acts passed in the Reign of King Charles II. subjecting multitudes of Clergymen and others to hardships and sufferings, not to be thought of without horror? * Did he never hear, what it was that occasioned

and want. And what were the crimes which drew this dreadful storm of Episcopal vengeance on them? Nothing but their scruples about the *surplace* and the *cap*, about *bowing at the name of Jesus*, about *Christ's descent into hell*, and such-like momentous points".—Dissent. Gent. answer, pag. 76.

* By one of these acts, no less than TWO THOUSAND ministers, many of them men of shining accomplishments, and all of them well spoken of for their piety, were turned out of their livings in one black day, whereby both they, and their families, became liable to starve for want of the necessaries of life. By another, they were banished five miles from any *City*, *Borough*, or *Church*, in which they had before ministred; whereby it was put very much out of the power of their neighbours and friends to afford them their charitable relief. By another act still, as though no cruelty was too severe, they were forbid meeting for the worship of God any where but in Episcopal Churches, and under the penalties of heavy fines, imprisonments, and even banishment to foreign Countries. "In consequence of "these cruel acts, vast numbers of pious Clergymen, "with multitudes of their people, were laid in prisons "among thieves and common malefactors, where they "suffered the greatest hardships, indignities, oppressi-"ons;—their houses rudely riffled, their goods made "a prey to hungry informers, and their families given "up to beggery and want. An estimate was published "of near EIGHT THOUSAND protestant dissenters, who "had perished in prison, in the Reign only of Charles "II. By severe penalties inflicted on them for assem-"bling to worship God, they suffered in their trade and "estates, in the compass of a few years, at least TWO "MILLIONS; and a list of SIXTY THOUSAND persons "was taken, who had suffered on a religious account, "betwixt the *restoration* and the *revolution*". Dissent. Gent. answ. to White, pag. 83, 84.

occaſioned the removal of our fore-fathers from their native land, to this part of the new, and then deſolate world? That they fled hither, as to a place of ſafe retreat from the oppreſſive power of tyranniſing Biſhops; chuſing rather to expoſe themſelves to external hardſhips and dangers, ſadly grievous, and extraordinarily trying, than wrong their conſciences by ſubmitting to meer human impoſitions in the worſhip of their maker?—Having now heard theſe things, if he never heard of them before, will he not ſuſpect, whether the repreſentation he has made of the "deplorably wretched condition" of the Church in America, is not a little romantic? Let it be ſuppoſed, to give his account it's full weight, that, in the courſe of ſixty years, fifty-two perſons have gone to England for orders, at the expence of one hundred pounds ſterling each; and that ten of theſe were ſo unfortunate as to loſe their lives in the adventure—Let it be ſuppoſed, that the Church will be ſtill liable to the ſame danger & expence, without a Biſhop.—Let it be ſuppoſed ſtill farther, that this danger and expence may be looked upon as great a grievance, as, in the nature of the thing, it can be.—And after all, will the caſe be "an unprecedented one"? Is this "the firſt example" of a "condition ſo wretched and deplorable"? Is the expence of a few thouſands in ſixty years, to be compared with the heavy fines that have been impoſed upon ſuch multitudes, at one time and another, for a much longer ſpace? Is this difficulty, attending the affair of ordination, to be ſet in competition with being ſilenced, turned out of livings, ſent to filthy jails, and confined there to periſh through poverty and miſery, which has been the caſe of thouſands?—To ſpeak of a few comparatively ſmall inconveni-

ences,

ences, (to make the moſt of them) as arguing a "condition wretched beyond all precedent", is to "declaim", not to reaſon; and to do it too in a manner that is really ridiculous. I would aſk the Dr. yet farther, are not the Diſſenters at home, even to this day, in a far worſe condition than the Church now is, or ever was, here, if their caſe be conſidered in it's moſt aggravated height? What is an HUNDRED POUNDS ſterling for FIFTY-TWO Clergymen each, in the courſe of SIXTY YEARS, in compariſon with the HUNDRED THOUSAND pounds ſterling, many times told, the Diſſenters have paid, in that time, towards the ſupport of the EPISCOPAL-CLERGY, beſides maintaining their own? And what is a much greater grievance ſtill, are they not, by "the poſitive exertion of civil power", deprived of their natural rights as men, by not being permitted, while they act conformably to the dictates of their conſciences, to ſuſtain any poſt, either of honor or profit, in the kingdom of South-Britain? Perhaps, theſe hardſhips, being endured by Diſſenters only, may be thought worthy of little or no notice. But Diſſenters, to uſe the Dr's own words, upon another occaſion, "have the ſame feelings, the ſame ſenſibility with other perſons, and are equally affected with any ſufferings". Upon the whole, it is highly extravagant, I might rather ſay, to a great degree ludicrous, to ſpeak of the Church, in America, as "without a precedent", in point of grievance, ſhould what has been ſaid be conſidered, in all it's force, without the leaſt abatement. But, if viewed in it's proper light, as accompanied with the mitigations, and leſſenings that have been mentioned, it will appear, if at all a grievance, but a very light one; and ſo mixt with kindneſs as to give occaſion rather for gratitude, than complaint.

THE

THE Dr. having endeavoured to work upon the paſſions of the people, now comes to try his ſkill upon thoſe in power. He begins with claiming it as the right of Epiſcopalians here to be "conſidered as equal with the foremoſt, in every due expreſſion of fidelity and loyalty". We won't contend with him, while he only makes them "equal", not ſuperior, to the other denominations of men in the Country; who eſteem themſelves as ſtrongly bound to fidelity and loyalty to the Britiſh Crown, upon the "principles of Chriſtianity", as well as from "preſent intereſt and inclination". If he really meant no reflection, when he ſaid, "no trumpet of ſedition was ever heard to ſound from our pulpits—no words of ſedition have been ſuffered more privately to be ſown in our houſes", as he ſeems to declare in a marginal note, we will find no fault; though ſome are diſpoſed to think, he would not have expreſſed himſelf in this manner, unleſs he had intended an inſinuation, that ſomething of this nature had been done by others.

HAVING thus proclaimed the extraordinary loyalty of the Church, he proceeds to the work of expoſtulation. "If then the Church of England in "America is not diſtinguiſhed by the want of duty "and affection to the Government, why ſhould it "be thus diſtinguiſhed and ſtigmatized by the "want of thoſe religious privileges, which are "granted to all other denominations of chriſtians "whatever, in the Britiſh dominions"? Strangers to the real ſtate of things in the Country would be naturally and obviouſly led, by what is here ſaid, to imagine, that ſome great difference was *poſitively* made, by the Government at home, betwixt Epiſcopalians in the Colonies, and other denominations

nominations of chriſtians; favoring the latter, and putting ſome "ſtigmatizing" mark upon the former: Whereas the truth is, they are allowed the ſame liberty with all other perſuaſions, and do, with as much freedom from moleſtation, worſhip God in the preciſe way they themſelves are pleaſed to chuſe. All the difference is, our principles do not hamper us with thoſe objected difficulties, their's expoſe them to. He goes on, "in our petitioning for Biſhops, all that we aſk for our ſelves, is what has been freely granted to others, what has been refuſed to none elſe who have applied for it". We know of nothing that has been granted to others, and refuſed to none, but what is equally granted to them, and has never been refuſed. No denomination of chriſtians in the Colonies ever aſked, or deſired, more than free liberty to ſerve God conformably to the dictates of their conſciences; and this liberty the Church enjoys, in common with all others. No; they are not upon an "equal footing" with their neighbours. So it ſhould ſeem the Dr. thinks, by what immediately follows. Says he, "we requeſt only the liberty of enjoying the "inſtitutions of our Church, and thereby of being "put upon an equal footing with our neighbours— "with the various ſects of Engliſh diſſenters, who "have the full enjoyment of their reſpective forms "of Eccleſiaſtical government and diſcipline—and "even with the Moravians and Papiſts, who are "ſeverally allowed a Biſhop". It may be pertinently aſked here, what inſtitution of the Church is not enjoyed here, ſave only confirmation, which the Dr. has thought proper to paſs over, leaving it out of the preſent debate? As to "diſcipline" and "ordination", he does not complain, as in juſtice he could not, of the real want of either;

but the only complaint is, that the former is incomplete without a Bishop, and the latter attended with inconvenience. And is there no difference between NOT ENJOYING AT ALL these institutions of the Church, and enjoying them *partially* and with *inconvenience?* Besides, whence does it arise, that Episcopalians do not enjoy the institutions of religion as *fully* and *completely* as the other denominations of christians? Can it, with the least appearance of reason, be ascribed to any peculiar favor the government has shewn to these denominations, to the exclusion of them? Far from it. It is the natural result from their own principles, and not at all owing to any distinction that has been made between them and other christians.

IT will, perhaps, be said here, if, according to the principles they profess, they cannot *fully* enjoy the institutions of the English Church without a Bishop at their head, why should they be denied one? I answer, for reasons that shall hereafter be mentioned, which, I would hope, will be thought sufficient by indifferent judges. In the mean time, I would only say, if the KING, who is acknowledged by Episcopalians to be the head of the Church in America, as well as England, does not see fit, in his great wisdom, to favor them beyond any other of his subjects in the Colonies, as he must do by sending them Bishops, which, though spiritual officers, are yet greatly expensive ones, why should they make such bitter complaints? It would not argue their being over-modest, if they esteemed him as good a judge of what was proper to be done in this case, as themselves. Possibly, he may think greater inconveniences would attend the settlement of an Episcopate, at so great a distance from him, than

than thoſe that are conſequent upon the preſent want of it.—Poſſibly, he may be apprehenſive, it might prove an occaſion of "bitterneſs, envy, anger, wrath, clamor, ſtrife, and evil-ſpeaking", thoſe "works of the fleſh", which are deſtructive of all true religion.—Poſſibly, he may fear ſome ill effects relative to the ſtate.—But, whatever the reaſons are, which reſtrain his Majeſty from eſtabliſhing Biſhops in America, his wiſe pleaſure ſhould certainly make them eaſie; eſpecially, as they own him to be the ſupreme Governor of the Church.

In aggravation of the Church's "unprecedented" hardſhip, the Dr. goes on to ſay, in "apoſtolic times", care was taken to form chriſtians, as they increaſed, into "proper Eccleſiaſtical diſtricts, and to appoint Biſhops for each". If he means, that, as "the number of diſciples was multiplied", they were "added to the Churches" in theſe and thoſe places, which had paſtors at their head; or were formed into new Churches with paſtors over them, this is very true: And we heartily wiſh, that all the Churches in America had ſuch Paſtors, or Biſhops. But if he intends, that chriſtians were, in thoſe days, "formed into diſtricts with Biſhops over them", in any meaſure conformable to the manner of the Church of England, or that which is intended for the Church in America, he is groſly miſtaken. There were then no ſuch diſtricts or Biſhops. And if we purſue the hiſtory of the Church, through the times that may, with any propriety, be called truly primitive, we ſhall meet with no inſtance of this kind; nor can an inſtance be produced, until there had "come a falling away firſt", and that "man of ſin" began to be "revealed", who hath oppoſed himſelf to all that is

called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, has set in the temple of God, shewing that he was himself God".

The Dr. by recuring to the "records of Paganism and Mahometanism", to magnifie the neglect of the Church in America by his superiors in England, is both ungrateful and unreasonable.—He is ungrateful, as they have for more than sixty years been expressing their pious regards to it, by expending, at the lowest computation, thirty thousand pounds sterling to promote it's growth. And he is as unreasonable, in that, notwithstanding the discovery of so much concern for the Church in the Colonies, he would make them even worse than "Pagans", or "Mahometans", because they do not gratifie his fond desires in establishing an Episcopate here, after the mode of the Church at home. Let me take this opportunity to remind the Dr. once for all, that, as it lies with the KING, whether they shall, or shall not, have Bishops in America, all his complaints finally terminate on him: For this reason, I could wish he had expressed more dutiful reverence towards his Sovereign, than to charge him, as he does virtually, and in reality of construction, with treating the Church here with "UNPARALLELED HARDSHIP; PERSECUTION, or what is AS BAD IN IT'S CONSEQUENCES; yea, with NEGLECT SO GRIEVOUS as not to be REDEEMED", either by PAGANS, or MAHOMETANS. It is hoped, the Clergy of the Church of England, in their address to his Majesty, have spoken to him with more decency, and becoming reverence.

ANSWER

ANSWER to SECTION V. assigning Reasons why the Church in America has been thus neglected.

THIS Section would have been wholly passed over, as we have no concern with the more immediate contents of it, but that the Dr. has, here and there, mixt with his reasons, why the Church has been so greatly neglected, some matters of intelligence it may be fit to take into consideration.

THE first I would mention is thus expressed, "the propriety of sending a Bishop to these Colonies", that is, the Colonies that were settled by those who had an aversion to Episcopal government, "will be disputed by none". This is nothing more than a rattle to please children with. If a Bishop is sent, will he have nothing to do in these Colonies? Will they not be part of his Dioceſs? Will not the Episcopal-Churches in them, at least their Clergy, be under his inspection and government? All that can be meant, by the "acknowledged impropriety" of sending a Bishop to these Colonies, is only this, that it may not be proper he should, at present, have his seat here. But still, he will be as completely settled at the head

head of the Epiſcopal Clergy, within theſe bounds, as in the other Colonies; and will have the ſame right of ſuper-intending and governing them. So that, if his place of reſidence ſhould not be here, his power will; and it will be the ſame, in all it's exerciſes, as in any of the other Provinces: Nor are we ſo deſtitute of foreſight as not to ſee, that it will be thought as "proper", a Biſhop ſhould have his *ſeat* in theſe Colonies, as in any of the other, whenever a fit opportunity, with promiſing circumſtances, ſhall preſent.

ANOTHER piece of intelligence we are let into is, that however "negligent" and "ſtupid" the Epiſcopalians here have been, about the affair of an Epiſcopate in America, it has engaged the attention of their ſuperiors at home for more than ſixty years. "The worthy Society, to whom the nation, and the chriſtian world in general, are under great obligations, and to whoſe unexampled liberality, indefatigable application, and amazing perſeverance, the Church of England owes it's VERY EXISTENCE, at this day, in SOME OF THE COLONIES"; I ſay, this Society in particular has moſt heartily and vigorouſly employed it's pains in proſecution of this good work, by "making all proper repreſentations of the caſe to Queen Ann in her day"; by "purchaſing a houſe in New-Jerſey, for the reſidence of a Biſhop" ſome time after; by "obtaining an order from the Crown for a bill to be drawn, and laid before the Parliament for eſtabliſhing an American Epiſcopate; by attempting the ſame thing, with the ſame ſpirit, the next reign, and with an encouraging proſpect of ſucceſs": And the "venerable Patrons and Supporters of the Church in America", this ſame worthy

worthy Society, "have continued to keep sight of this great object, and have been WATCHING FOR SEASONABLE OPPORTUNITIES OF EXERTING THEMSELVES TO OBTAIN IT". Who now can be at a loss to know the true reason of the application of such vast sums of money, in those Colonies that stood in little or no need of such pious charity! Who can help yielding the full assent of his mind to this affirmed truth, that it is, in the opinion of Episcopalians here, and their superiors at home, an "indisputed impropriety" to fix a Bishop in the New-England Colonies, should the way be duly prepared for it!

I SHALL here add to the intelligence the Dr. has given us, that there never was a time, since the incorporation of the Society for the propagation of the Gospel, wherein such earnest and vigorous efforts were made, both in the Colonies and in England, to obtain the long wished-for blessing, an American-Episcopate. No pains have been wanting, no methods left untried, in order to bring this into event. The whole Clergy of the Church of England here are united in their endeavours; and, without all doubt, have been spirited hereto by instructions from those, in high dignity at home, who have promised their influence and assistance in an affair of so great importance. Surely the Dr. had no need to have taken up so much of the preceding section, in fetching arguments from the apostolic, and succeeding times; yea, from the records of "Paganism" and "Mahometanism", to excite in superiors there compassion towards the poor American Church, in it's "deplorable wretched condition"; or rather to shame them for their neglect in taking so little care of it's interest. Perhaps,

haps, there never was a Church, in any chriſtian Colony, in any part of the earth, that has had more done for it, or that has been the object of a more ſollicitous concern in the minds of better friends, and more able Patrons. It muſt not be eſteemed a matter of wonder, if we are ſo far alarmed, as to conſider, and ſpeak freely upon ſo intereſting an occaſion.——

THE laſt article of intelligence relates to the external circumſtances of the Biſhop that is deſired to be ſent to America. "A ſeat has been purchaſed for his reſidence, at ſix hundred pounds ſterling expence, in a convenient Manſion-houſe and lands, ſituate at Burlington in the Jerſeys". And, as the Dr. declares elſewhere, pag. 108. "a fund "has been eſtabliſhed for this particular purpoſe, "(the ſupport of a Biſhop) for more than half a "Century paſt; and many worthy perſons have "contributed generouſly and largely to the in-"creaſe of it". Says he, "I can recollect, as I "am writing, the following inſtances: Arch-"Biſhop *Tenniſon*, who has been dead upwards of "fifty years, bequeathed to it one THOUSAND "POUNDS ſterling; Sir *Jonathan Trelawners*, near "the ſame time, another THOUSAND POUNDS; the "Lady *Elizabeth Haſtings*, FIVE HUNDRED POUNDS; "Biſhop *Butler*, FIVE HUNDRED POUNDS; Biſhop "*Benſon*, TWO HUNDRED POUNDS; Biſhop *Oſ-*"*baldaſton*, FIVE HUNDRED POUNDS; and Mr. "*Fiſher*, ONE THOUSAND POUNDS. Theſe, and "all other ſums, which the Society have received "for this uſe, were put into the public funds as "ſoon as paid into their hands, and have been ac-"cumulating ever ſince, excepting what they ex-"pended at Burlington. If this ſtock is not

"ſufficient

" ſufficient for the ſupport of a proper Epiſcopate " in America, I imagine the difficulty of making it " ſufficient will not be great. For, as many have " given liberally on the *remote proſpect* of it's be- " ing needed, it is not to be doubted but bene- " factors will be raiſed up, when aſſiſtance ſhall be " called for by a *preſent neceſſity*".

It is unqueſtionable, from theſe paſſages, if a Biſhop is ſent to America, that ſuch proviſion muſt be made for his ſupport, as will enable him to appear in all the grandeur of a Biſhop in England. His place of reſidence, and manner of living, muſt exceed a common Clergyman's in proportion to his much more exalted ſtation in the Church. Such Biſhops were unknown in the chriſtian world, in it's firſt days of purity: Nor do we read of them, until chriſtians had groſly departed from that ſimplicity in living, which was their primitive glory. At ſo great a diſtance from apoſtolic times as the third Century, though corruption had then crept into the Church, Paul of Samoſata, Biſhop of Antioch, and one of Cyprian's contemporaries, was depoſed, among other things, for this, " that, having been poor before he was Biſhop, he had after that grown very rich, born ſecular dignities, paſſed the ſtreets with a train of attendants, and erected to himſelf a magnificent ſeat in the Church". * Nay, a good while after this, though the Church had grown ſtill more corrupt, the fourth council of Carthage decreed, " that the Biſhop ſhall have a little dwelling-houſe near the Church; that he ſhall have but courſe houſhold-ſtuff and diet, and ſeek his reputation only by ſound doctrine, and a good life; that he ſhall not ſpend his time in caring for

* Euſeb. Lib. 7. Cap. 30.

his family, but be employed wholly in reading, praying, and preaching the word of God". * And some of our reformers, of high distinction in the Church, have freely spoken against the opulence and grandeur of Bishops. Says the good Arch-Bishop Cranmer, in a letter to my Lord Cromwel, "Even at "the beginning of Christ's professors, *Diotrephes* "desired to have *preheminence* in the Church. And "since, he hath had more successors, than all the A- "postles had; of whom have come all those glori- "ous titles, stiles & pomps, into the Church. But "I would, that I, and all my brethren the Bishops, "would leave all our stiles, and write the stile of "our offices, calling ourselves *the Apostles of Christ*: "So that we took not upon us the name vainly, but "were so even in deed. So that we might order "our Dioceſs in such sort, that neither paper, parch- "ment, lead or wax, but the very christian conver- "sation might be the letters & seals of our offices; "as the Corinthians were to Paul, to whom he said, "ye are the letters and seals of our Apostleship" † To the like purpose are those words of the famous Bishop Hooper, "They [the Bishops] know, that "the primitive Church had no such Bishops as be "now-a-days. If the fourth part of the Bishoprick "remained unto the Bishop, it were sufficient; the "third part to such as should teach good learning; "the second part to the poor of the Dioceſs; and "the other to maintain men of war for the safe- "guard of the common-wealth, it were better be- "stowed a great deal. For now it is ill used and "bestowed for the greater part upon those that have "no need of it.—If any man be offended with me "for thus saying, he loveth not his own health, nor "God's laws, no man's, out of which I am always "ready

* Can. 14, 17, 20, 24. † Pierce's Vind. Diſſen. p. 370.

" ready to prove the thing ſaid to be true".* Riches, if we may believe the word of truth, are attended with dangerous temptations; inſomuch, that it is really a difficult, extremely difficult, thing for one poſſeſſed of them, to prevent his being " drawn aſide by thoſe luſts, which drown men in perdition". Men are too ready, if they are much raiſed above others in worldly circumſtances, to grow big in their own apprehenſions, to be haughty and imperious; treating thoſe below them with inſolence and comtempt. They are too apt to ſet their hearts " upon that which is not"; to live high, keeping ſumptuous tables; to ſpend their time in eaſe and indolence, to the diſſipation of their minds, and unfitting them for thoſe ſpiritual exerciſes, without which they will have little reliſh for the things of God and religion. And, perhaps, this has been as common among the Clergy, as any other order of men; not excepting Biſhops themſelves. The excellent Biſhop Burnet, ſenſible of this, in an addreſs to his brethren, and ſucceſſors in the Epiſcopal office, thus expreſſes himſelf, " I wiſh the pomp of living, and the keep-" ing high tables, could be quite taken away. It " is a great charge, and no very decent one; a " great devourer of time, and will make you look " too like the men of the world. I hope this is a " burden to you; it was indeed one of the great-" eſt burdens of my life, to ſee ſo much time loſt, " and to be living in a luxurious courſe, which " might have been much better beſtowed. I had " not ſtrength enough to break through that, " which cuſtom has impoſed on thoſe provided with " plentiful Biſhopricks. I pray God to help you find a decent way of laying this down". † Riches

* Ibid. pag. 392.

† Hiſt. of his own time, Vol. VI. pag. 188.

and poverty are both extremes, neither of which ſeem ſutable for Clergy-men. "Conveniency of food and raiment" for them, and their families, is rather deſirable. More than this; to be ſure, an abundance of the world will be dangerous to them, and greatly hurtful to the Church of God. This is a truth in fact, and known to be ſo. Chriſtianity never ſuffered ſo much by all it's perſecutions by Pagan-powers, as by the pomp and grandeur of the Clergy, eſpecially of ſuperior orders. The riches of the Church, under the Patronage of thoſe Princes of the earth who were called it's "nurſing fathers", have been it's ruin, by being the occaſion, through abuſe, of thoſe numerous abominations, which have moſt ſhamefully defiled the temple of God. I am therefore free to declare it my hearty wiſh, that we may never have a Clergy, in the American world, for whoſe reſidence fine ſeats muſt be provided, and funds eſtabliſhed to bring in an income much better ſuted to maintain officers in a kingdom of this world, than that which is related to, and pertains to another, that is purely ſpiritual. And I wiſh this, not only in regard of the Epiſcopal-Clergy, but the Clergy of every denomination on the Continent; yea, the whole chriſtian world.

ANSWER

ANSWER to SECTION VI. which ſays the preſent Juncture is apprehended to be favorable to the Epiſcopate in queſtion.

THE Dr. here ſpeaks of it as "the opinion of many wiſe and judicious perſons, that the favourable opportunity", for eſtabliſhing an American Epiſcopate, "now preſents itſelf"; an opportunity, which "the circumſtances of the nation have never, until now, afforded". But, what are theſe circumſtances, which make the preſent, ſo favourable an opportunity? "The tumults of war have ceaſed, and the public tranquility reſtored, without any reaſonable ſuſpicion of a ſpeedy interruption". Was this never the caſe before, and within the memory of the Dr. himſelf? If he will only reflect a little, he may bring to mind a time, ſince he became capable of noticing facts, when "the circumſtances of the nation" were ſo very like to theſe, that he will not find it an eaſie matter to point out the difference. And are there "no reaſonable ſuſpicions of a ſpeedy interruption of the preſent tranquility"? He herein appears a ſtranger, not only to the known diſpoſition, and paſt conduct, of both France and Spain towards England, but to what they have been doing ever ſince the concluſion of the late war to ſtrengthen

their

their naval force, and put themſelves in a capacity to break the preſent peace.—Again, " the greateſt harmony ſubſiſts between our Mother-country, and moſt of the Colonies ; the late diſpute having been brought to a happy termination". It is true, the diſpute, relative to the STAMP-ACT, has been happily terminated. But has nothing intervened ſince, that has diſturbed the harmony between the Mother-country, and the Colonies ? Are " moſt of the Colonies" quite ſatisfied with the doings at home, brought into effect with reference to them ? One would think, by the repreſentation here made of them, that the Dr. had been ſhut up from the world, and knew not what was paſſing in it. There is nothing more certain, than that " moſt of the Colonies" think themſelves as nearly touched in their CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS by the late Parliamentary proceeding, as by the STAMP-ACT itſelf ; and they are every day groaning out their complaints ; though they are reſolved to do it in thoſe ways that are *legal*. It is ſtrange, that prejudice itſelf, though ſpeaking to promote a favourite-point, ſhould publicly ſay, that " the greateſt harmony now ſubſiſted between the Mother-country, and moſt of the Colonies". No fact related for truth was ever more diſtant from it.—Farther, " the plan of an American-Epiſcopate has been ſettled, and adjuſted in ſuch manner, that the religious privileges of none can be violated, or endangered". By whom has this plan been ſettled and adjuſted ? We have no good reaſon to think, that it has been done by thoſe, who have any conſtitutional-right to meddle, of their own meer motion, with matters of this nature ; and we ſhall ſee, in proper time, that, if it has been ſettled, it is not ſo adjuſted, but that the privileges, even of

Epiſcopalians,

Epiſcopalians, will be violated by it.—As to what follows, relating to "the happineſs of having a Prince upon the throne, who is unqueſtionably diſpoſed to promote the general intereſt of virtue and religion", the other denominations are as thankful as the Epiſcopalians can be; but do not look upon this an argument more favoring their cauſe than our's. We can chearfully rely on the impartial juſtice and goodneſs of the Britiſh Sovereign, not in the leaſt doubting his equal paternal regard to all his loyal Coloniſts of whatever claſs. We know not what "declarations he has made on the ſubject of an American-Epiſcopate"; but this we have abundant reaſon to believe, that he will do nothing in this matter, but what is wiſely and kindly fitted to promote the real good of his ſubjects here, not conſidered ſeparately, but in one collective view; which is all we deſire.—Theſe now are "the advantages", which, as the Dr. ſays, "peculiarly mark the preſent period". But they all, excepting the laſt, which is as favourable to us as them, may be juſtly looked upon as real diſadvantages, pointing out the preſent, as the moſt inconvenient juncture that could be pitched upon, for the accompliſhment of the great thing deſired.

THE Dr. now goes on to "other arguments for ſending Biſhops to America, never ſo urgent and forcible as at preſent".

ONE is, the "great increaſe" of profeſſors of the Church. "In the former part of this Century, they were ſmall and inconſiderable in compariſon with the amount of their preſent number". He is pleaſed to ſay, "that the Church of England in America contains now near a MILLION of

of members". This is more than once repeated in other parts of his performance; and the like account, we have been informed, has been inſerted in the petitions, the Epiſcopal-Clergy have ſent home to beſpeak the intereſt of their ſuperiors with reference to the miſſion of Biſhops to the Colonies. It is ſurpriſing, they ſhould publiſh it to the world, that their Church contains ſo great a number. They muſt certainly, in order to inhance the account, reckon the NEGROE-SLAVES * among the members

* The Dr. for reaſons beſt known to himſelf, did not chuſe to ſay, in plain words, that NEGROES, knowing nothing of religion, make a very large part of his MILLION of the "members of the Church of England". But it is evident, he has theſe in reſerve to ſave the truth of his affirmation. He ſays, pag. 55, "from general calculations it has been frequently ſaid, of late years, that the proper ſubjects of the Britiſh Crown in America amount to *three millions*". And again, pag. 89. "of the inhabitants of this Country a *full third part* belongs to the Church". Now, if there are not, as the Dr. will not pretend that there are, *three million* of inhabitants, or Britiſh ſubjects, unleſs the BLACKS are reckoned, the Church cannot have belonging to it a *third part*, or *one million*, of theſe inhabitants, if the blacks are left out of the account. This is more evident ſtill, from what the Dr. ſays of the ſurvey that was made of the number of inhabitants, in 1762. His words are, pag. 55, "It was then found, that they amounted to between two and three million in the Colonies, and Iſlands". Of theſe, ſays the Dr. pag. 57, "The blacks were found to be about eight hundred and forty four thouſand". A large deduction then muſt be made from the MILLION profeſſors of the Church, if the blacks are not counted. And in truth, the Dr. himſelf virtually acknowledges it; though, perhaps, he did not intend the acknowledgment ſhould be perceived. For he ſays, pag. 56, "of the WHITES"; that is in the

members of their Church" ; though not one in fifty of them know any thing more of Chriſtianity, than thoſe of the ſame color who live in Africa : Otherwiſe, it is not poſſible their account ſhould conſiſt with truth. In the two Provinces of Penſylvania and the Jerſies, there are no more than three Epiſcopal Churches that ſupport themſelves. The Society, if we may depend on their abſtracts, have but nineteen Miſſionaries. The Dr. ſays, there are, in theſe Colonies, a conſiderable number of Churches and Congregations without Clergymen. It is reaſonably ſuppoſed, theſe deſtitute Congregations, for much the greater part, are ſimilar to the ſcattered handfuls of Epiſcopalians in ſome of our New-England towns, conſiſting, in ſome places, of three or four ; in others of half a dozen ; in others ſtill, of a dozen or fifteen families. However, that there might be no complaint that we are diſpoſed to leſſen their real number, we ſhall reckon them all as Congregations equally numerous with thoſe that have Miſſionaries. Their number then, according to the Dr. will be forty-ſeven ; which, with the three we before mentioned, will make fifty.—In the Pro-

P vince

the above-mentioned ſurvey, which found between two and three Million inhabitants in the Colonies and Iſlands, " the profeſſors of the Church were about a *third part*". So that, according to the Dr's own account, no more WHITES belong to the Church than about *one third part* of between two and three Million, after eight hundred and forty four thouſand Blacks have been deducted. And yet this reckoning, though it takes off ſeveral hundred thouſands from the MILLION profeſſors of the Church, that had been before numbered, is carried much too high, the *Blacks* not being admitted into the account ; as may be ſeen in what is ſaid above.

vince of New-York, there are three Epiſcopal Churches that ſubſiſt without help from the Society. The Miſſionaries, by the abſtracts, are eleven; and as the Dr. has ſaid nothing here of deſtitute Churches, we ſhall take it for granted, that fourteen is the number of Epiſcopal Congregations in this Province.—In the four New-England Colonies, Connecticut, Rhode-Iſland, Maſſachuſetts, and New-Hampſhire, there may be three Epiſcopal Churches that are ſupported within themſelves, though I certainly know of no more than two. The Miſſionaries, by the Society's account, are thirty. The members of the Church, ſettled here and there in towns, where there are no Miſſionaries, may poſſibly make a number equal to ſix or ſeven Congregations that are ſupplied with Clergymen. The Churches then, in the New-England-Colonies, will be forty. According to this computation, which, I am perſuaded, exceeds the truth, there are, in the ſeven Colonies, extending from Penſylvania to the utmoſt northern bounds of the Maſſachuſetts-Province, one hundred and four Epiſcopal Churches. Let it now be ſuppoſed, there are fifty families belonging to a Church one with another; which, I believe, Epiſcopalians themſelves will think full allowance. Let it alſo be ſuppoſed, there are five perſons to each family; which is again large allowance, as there are few families in which all the members go to Church: In ſome, not more than one goes; in others, not more than two or three. The amount then of all theſe profeſſors of the Church is only twenty ſix thouſand; a meer handful in compariſon with more than a million perſons, which, without diſpute, live within theſe bounds. And, if we ſhould take in Nova-Scotia, in whichthere are more

of

of other denominations, than there are of Epiſcopalians, the number would not riſe to more than twenty eight or twenty nine thouſand. But we will allow thirty thouſand. There is ſtill wanting nine hundred and ſeventy thouſand to make up the MILLION of Epiſcopalian profeſſors we are told of. And where ſhall we find theſe? Are they to be found in the Colonies ſouthward of Penſylvania? In all theſe, unleſs we reckon the blacks as members of the Church of England, we ſhall fall vaſtly ſhort of the number that is wanted; and the ſame muſt be ſaid, ſhould we take in all the *whites* of all the Engliſh Weſt-India Iſlands. It is acknowledged, there are more Epiſcopalians in Virginia and Maryland, than other denominations; but all their *white* inhabitants, together with thoſe of the Carolinaes, and Georgia, even to Florida, will not make one half the number that is wanting; as might be made to appear by ſurveys that have been taken of their numbers. But if we ſubſtract Quakers, Bapiſts, Preſbyterians, and Roman-Catholics, which are numerous eſpecially in Maryland, and thoſe alſo who make no profeſſion at all, and attend no public worſhip after any mode whatever, [and ſurely it would be too ſhameful to reckon ſuch as "members of the Church"] it is really queſtionable, whether the amount of Epiſcopal profeſſors, in all theſe Colonies, will be more than about two hundred and ſeventy thouſand. So that, confining ourſelves to the American Colonies, it cannot, as we judge, be ſuppoſed, with any probability of reaſon, that there are ſo many as one third part of that MILLION of "members of the Church" the Dr. has reckoned, not taking in the *blacks*. So widely diſtant are our apprehenſions from his, concerning this matter.

EITHER the Gentleman that made "a ſurvey of the inhabitants in the Colonies and Iſlands, and a diſtribution of them into their ſeveral claſſes, in 1762", was egregiouſly miſtaken, or the Dr. in his account from him, when he ſays, "of the *whites*, the profeſſors of the Church were about a third part; the Preſbyterians, Independants and Anabaptiſts, were not ſo many; the Germans and other denominations amounted to more". There are no independants that I know of in any of the Provinces. The Preſbyterians and Congregationiſts are perhaps as numerous as all the other denominations, Non-epiſcopal, put together; and theſe only are more than double the number of all the Epiſcopalian-*whites* on the American Continent; as could demonſtrably be made to appear, was it worth while to be at the trouble of making calculations, and exhibiting the grounds on which they are made.

THE Dr. to add force to his argument in favor of the miſſion of Biſhops, would bring in the Negroes, "who have been found, ſays he, to be about eight hundred and forty four thouſand". His head and heart are ſo filled with the notion of an Epiſcopate, that he ſeems diſpoſed to imagine it the beſt fitted mean for every good purpoſe that can be mentioned. As he thought it proper to take notice of the poor Negroes, could he have hit upon nothing but an Epiſcopate for their relief? This, at beſt, is a far-fetch'd, round-about expedient; and would, probably be of little ſervice, was it to take effect. Their forlorn caſe calls for a more direct and powerful remedy. As "ſharers with us in the ſame common nature", have they not the ſame natural eſſential rights? And are not theſe outragiouſly invaded, while they are held in ignoble ſlavery?

Are

Are they not inhumanly trampled upon, while they are treated as though they were nothing better than ſo many beaſts of burden? It is moſt horribly ſhameful, that ſo many of the human ſpecies, as good by nature as their maſters, and that have as good a right to the FREEDOM OF MEN, ſhould be bought and ſold as though they were cattle; and dealt with as though they were an inferior order to dogs! If, inſtead of an Epiſcopate, for the benefit of theſe greateſt of all ſufferers in his Majeſty's dominions, an act of Parliament had been propoſed to ſet them all free, or to prohibit the enſlaving any more for time to come, or to reſtrain the cruelty of the Planters in their uſuage of them, it would have been much more to the purpoſe. It is a diſhonor to Engliſhmen, who eſteem it their diſtinguiſhing glory, that they enjoy the fulleſt reaſonable liberty, to make SLAVES, and in the moſt abject ſenſe, of ſuch amazing numbers of their fellow-men. It is an abomination highly worthy of a Parliamentary interpoſition. This would do the poor Negroes infinitely more ſervice, than to ſettle an Epiſcopate over their maſters, who cannot be ſuppoſed to have any tolerable degree of religion, while they thus palpably break in upon the moſt evidently plain laws of righteouſneſs and goodneſs, to their eternal diſgrace as reaſonable moral agents. I have often wondered, nothing has been done in the Colonies to put a ſtop to the cruelly unjuſt practice of making ſlaves of the poor Negroes; eſpecially, as they have, for ſome years, been ſighing out the moſt bitter complaints againſt all tendencies towards their being enſlaved themſelves. Is this to act a conſiſtent part? Is it, in any equitable ſenſe, doing to others as they would others ſhould do to them?

THE

THE laſt argument, "for granting an American Epiſcopate", is taken "from the obligations of gratitude; a national ſenſe of which ought, at this time, to have peculiar efficacy": As, "by a ſignal interpoſition of divine providence, the Britiſh arms in America have triumphed over all that oppoſed them, prodigiouſly extending our Colonies by new acquiſitions, and ſecuring them, not only by treaty, but by a total annihilation of that power on the Continent, whereby our former ſafety was chiefly endangered". What ſpecial connection the victorious ſucceſs of the Britiſh arms in America, under the bleſſing of providence, has with the eſtabliſhment of an Epiſcopate here, is not ſo very eaſie to diſcern. It is readily owned, "every wiſe nation ſees and acknowledges God in ſuch events: and every religious nation will make ſome ſutable returns to him for ſuch extraordinary favors". And it is hoped, ſome ſuch returns have been made. If not, the nation, including the Colonies, are juſtly chargeable with great ingratitude to that al-wiſe righteous being, who turned the late war ſo much in their favor. But, ſays the Dr. "the circumſtances of things evidently point out two duties to our Governors, both of them important in themſelves, and of indiſpenſible obligation. One is, the further ſecurity and ſupport of the true religion in America, in thoſe places, where it already is; and the other, the propagation of it in thoſe places to which it has not hitherto been extended". By the "farther ſecurity and ſupport of the TRUE RELIGION in America", the Dr. muſt mean, to make his arguing pertinent, the providing for the ſupport of an Epiſcopate, as an expedient for the ſecurity of the TRUE RELIGION, that is, the religion of the Church

Church of England. Surely, his imagination has here got the better of his judgment. Is the religion of the Church of England the only true religion on the American Continent? Is religion, in none of the other forms, to be regarded? Were Epiſcopalians the only Coloniſts employed, under God, to effect the late glorious conqueſts? We do not eſteem it a duty, much leſs an indiſpenſible one, in conſequence of theſe conqueſts, to provide for the ſecurity or ſupport of the religion of Epiſcopalians, any more than the religion of other denominations of chriſtians in the Colonies. And of all denominations, the profeſſors of the Church have the leaſt to ſay upon the head of "farther ſupport", as they are, in moſt of the Colonies, provided for by the Society at home at an annual great expence.—As to the other duty, "the propagation of religion, in thoſe places to which it has not been extended"; ſuch a ſenſe of it was impreſſed upon the hearts of the rulers, miniſters and Laity, more eſpecially in this Province, that proper meaſures were concerted, and Miſſionaries actually ſent to the Mohawk-Country, to carry the goſpel to them; but the whole deſign was made void, becauſe it was not to be executed by profeſſors of the Church, according to the Epiſcopalian mode. More may be ſaid of this hereafter.

The Dr. goes on, "as America is the region, wherein the divine goodneſs has been more immediately diſplayed in favor of the Britiſh nation; ſo America is evidently the very ground on which ſome ſutable monument of gratitude ought to be erected". And what monument is this? In conſiſtency with the courſe of the preſent argument, it muſt be the eſtabliſhment of an Epiſcopate.

How

How is this made out? After the following manner, if at all; "the honor of God is moſt directly promoted by public worſhip—that worſhip muſt be moſt acceptable to him, wherein the adoration of his creatures are regularly offered him, in the ſolemn offices of the pureſt and beſt religion—and the national religion muſt be ſuppoſed beſt to anſwer theſe characters in the national opinion". It is far from being true, that the religious adorations of the Church of England are the "pureſt and beſt", or that their worſhip is, on this account, "moſt acceptable to God". But, ſuppoſing this to be the *national opinion*, meaning hereby, the opinion of thoſe in the nation, who are members of the eſtabliſhed Church; what is the conſequence herefrom? Says the Dr. "it naturally follows, that the ſtate of the national religion here [in the Colonies] has a right, on this occaſion, to the peculiar attention of thoſe, who are entruſted with the direction of our public affairs". It needs ſomething more than a bare affirmation to make this an undoubted truth. The other denominations think they have as good a right, as the Epiſcopalians, to the attention of thoſe, who have the management of the public affairs; and, in many of the Colonies, it is thought, they have, in ſtrict juſtice, a PECULIAR right. But, let it be ſuppoſed, that the PECULIAR right lies on the ſide of the Church of England;—what then? This Church, in America, without a Biſhop, "is periſhing for want of common neceſſaries; ſhe has been long imploring relief under ſuch diſeaſes, [being deſtitute of a Biſhop] as muſt prove fatal to her, if much longer neglected". What is the conſequence? Her requeſt muſt be anſwered, as a SUTABLE MONUMENT OF GRATITUDE for the late

late divine appearances in favor of the British arms in America. Heaven and earth are called upon to judge, whether this is unreasonable! This is the Dr's argument in full force, so far as it has any. Upon which I would ask, is it indeed a truth, that the Church of England, in the Colonies, "is in a perishing condition for want of necessaries"? Is it a real object of faith, that "her diseases are such as must prove fatal to her", if she is much longer without a Bishop? Surely, this representation of her case must be the effect of zeal, not conducted by knowledge. And, had not the Dr been under the influence of an undue warmth of spirit, he would never have thought, much less have publicly said, that an AMERICAN EPISCOPATE, for the relief of the Church, under her diseases operating to her speedy ruin, was that SPECIAL MONUMENT OF GRATITUDE that ought to be erected in return for God's goodness, displayed in favor of the British arms in this part of the world. I scarce know how to speak upon the matter seriously, it is placed in so ludicrous a light. Notwithstanding the "diseased perishing" state of the American Church, have not praises and adorations, according to the "purest and best" forms of devotion, been offered up to almighty God, in all the Episcopal assemblies on the Continent, for the marvellous interpositions of his providence, on our behalf, in the late war? If this is not the truth, they are far behind the other denominations of christians, whose religious thankful adorations have publicly been presented to the divine majesty on this account, in their way, however short it may have fallen of the "better and more pure" mode of praising God in practice by the Church. There have also been NATIONAL religious adorations for

this NATIONAL mercy; and, if they proceeded from truly thankful hearts, they are, in the account of the ſacred books, a ſutable expreſſion of gratitude. But the Church here is ſtill in want of Biſhops; and there is therefore ſtill wanting the moſt SUTABLE MONUMENT OF GRATITUDE, for theſe favors of heaven. Grateful hearts, and well-ordered converſations, may poſſibly be as SUTABLE MONUMENTS, upon this occaſion, as the ſettlement of an EPISCOPATE. If the Coloniſts, whether Epiſcopalians, or others, have not, by this goodneſs of God, been engaged to love him with all their hearts, and to ſerve him with all their powers, no other return will atone for the want of this, not excepting there being an EPISCOPATE eſtabliſhed here. This is what God mainly expects; with this he will be pleaſed, yea, a thouſand times more pleaſed, than with the miſſion of as many Biſhops as can be deſired. I appeal to heaven and earth for the truth of this.

ANSWER

ANSWER to SECTION VII. in which the Caſe of the American Heathens is particularly conſidered, and ſaid to require an Epiſcopate.

WE are as fully ſenſible as the Dr. or any of the Epiſcopalians, can be, that it is "the duty of thoſe whom the "day-ſpring from on high" has viſited, to communicate this light to others, and, as they have opportunity, to give the knowledge of religion to thoſe who are without it". We think, with him, that "the providence of God points out this general duty by the late events, more plainly and expreſly than ever. We never had until this time, ſo favourable an opportunity for carrying forward this bleſſed work: We never had it ſo much in our power; and our obligations of gratitude were never ſo ſtrong"; nor the arguments that may be fetched from the "principles of worldly policy". Theſe, and ſuch like, powerful motives have often been urged upon our people, both publicly and privately. We do therefore moſt cordially join with the Dr. in every thing he has ſaid to repreſent the reaſonableneſs, the indiſpenſible duty of a pious concern for the aboriginal-natives of America, expreſſed in all ſutable endeavours to aquaint them with "the goſpel of the bleſſed God". The difference between us lies in this, we do not think, that

an Epiſcopate in the Colonies is ſo connected with this duty, but that it may very well be performed without one; nor do we believe that an Epiſcopate is peculiarly pointed out by thoſe events that have made the preſent, the moſt convenient time for extending the knowledge of the only true God, and his Son Jeſus Chriſt, to theſe uttermoſt parts of the earth. The Dr. is of the contrary opinion. His principal aim indeed, in this ſection, is to ſhew, that our duty, in regard of the American-Heathen, more eſpecially in conſideration of the happy events of the late war, requires an Epiſcopate. His reaſoning here takes in a variety of articles. They are comprehended in the following ſummary, but juſt, repreſentation. "From "repeated trials, it appears, that there muſt be "ſome more effectual way for the converſion of "Savages, than has been yet taken. It was "hoped that the converſion of Indians would na-"turally introduce among them civility of man-"ners; but it ſeems now to be generally agreed, "that what was propoſed as a *conſequence*, ought "to be conſidered as a *neceſſary means* of ſpreading "the goſpel among ſavage nations.—It having "then become a ſettled point, that the moſt pro-"per way for converting Savages, is previouſly to "inſtruct them in the arts and manners of civil "life, the SOCIETY has been, for a conſiderable "time, employed in collecting ſuch intelligence, "relating to this ſubject, as to enable them to "form a proper plan for civilizing the nations of "America, in order to their being chriſtians.—— "But a variety of plans have been tranſmitted "from this Country. The perſons who have been "conſulted, have their particular prejudices and "attachments. The things and places which one

"repreſents

" repreſents as expedient, are condemned by ano-
" ther.—To balance and adjuſt ſo many different
" repreſentations would be a work of much time,
" and of courſe retard the execution of the gene-
" ral plan. A falſe ſtep in the beginning might
" produce conſequences that are fatal. But theſe
" difficulties would vaniſh, in a great meaſure, un-
" der an Epiſcopate. In a ſyſtem of this kind,
" where a number of powers and movements are
" to be employed, to one common purpoſe, a re-
" gular and conſiſtent direction of them is requi-
" ſite.—Upon the whole, a Biſhop is thought to
" be the moſt proper perſon to be entruſted with
" this ſuper-intending influence, one therefore muſt
" be appointed and ſent in order to a compli-
" ance with the duty, ariſing from the late victo-
" ries on the American-Continent". This, in ſum, is the Dr's argument in all it's parts.

As to the firſt; " it's being generally agreed, that the moſt proper way for converting Savages, is previouſly to inſtruct them in the arts and manners of civil life"; it may be juſtly queſtioned, whether it exhibits the truth of fact. I am confident it does not, if this "general agreement" is ſuppoſed to extend to the more northern Colonies. We are here pretty generally inclined to think, that the increaſe of temptations, from the arts and manners of civil life, would rather be an hindrance to their converſion, than a previouſly proper requiſite in order to it. The Indian-Natives have certainly been hurt, not ſerved, by being put into the Engliſh way of living. Many tribes of them, in the Maſſachuſetts-Province, have, by this means, been ſo depopulated, that there are now ſcarce any remains of them to be ſeen. And I am fully perſuaded,

ſuaded, the taking them off from the way of life they have been ſo long accuſtomed to, and getting them into that which is in uſe among us, would be an effectual method to put an end to their lives in the world. Nor is there any need of what is called civilizing them, in order to their embracing Chriſtianity. Their being Savages, and living in a way different from what we do, is no reaſon why their converſion may not be expected, if ſutable means are uſed with them. The deſign of the religion of Jeſus is to humaniſe, as well as chriſtianiſe the ſoul, to meliorate the temper, to ſoften it's roughneſs, and of ſavage to make it meek and gentle. And this will be it's effect, in whomſoever it is really planted; and, without ſuch implantation, men may be ſavage, notwithſtanding the arts and manners of civil life; inſtances of which are too common, even in the moſt civiliſed nations. It may be worthy of notice here, the Canadians never made it any part of their care to change the Indian's mode of civil life; and yet, they found ways to attach numerous tribes of them ſo firmly to the religion of Rome, that it is a vain thing to try to bring them to a better ſenſe of things. And why may not we, in like manner, implant the religion of the goſpel in the minds of thoſe, who have not been as yet indoctrinated in the principles of Popery? Should we expend as much zeal and pains to make them good Chriſtians, as the French have done to make them good Catholics, we ſhould, I doubt not, ſoon ſee the happy fruits of it; though no care ſhould be taken to bring them into our way of civil life.

The next link in the chain of reaſoning is, "the Society's having, after great pains in collecting informations,

informations, formed a plan to civiliſe the Indian-Nations, in order to the making them Chriſtians". One would not have expected to have ſeen the Society brought in here, as ſo eſſential a part of the argument. For it is affirmed, a few pages back, " if we examine it's Charter, we ſhall find it as evident as language can make it, that the ſupport and propagation of the goſpel among OUR OWN PEOPLE IN AMERICA, was the immediate and principal deſign of their incorporation. The converſion of the heathen was not their primary and immediate object". This is ſaid to ſhew, that the Society has been " abuſed", when ſpoken of as expending their charity in the Engliſh Colonies, to the too great neglect of the Indian-Heathen. And thoſe who have been thus " abuſive to the Society" are charged with the guilt of " petulent tongues", or " pens". But now an Epiſcopate is in view, it is their proper work, and in diſtinction from all others, to diſcharge the duty of ſending the goſpel to the American-infidel Natives. The writers on the Epiſcopalian ſide have the advantage beyond all others. They can make uſe of the ſame argument, with a good grace, to contrary purpoſes. When the Church is to be increaſed in the Colonies, the Society perfectly fall in with the great deſign of their inſtitution, while they lay out ſo much of their money to ſerve this end, that they have little left to chriſtianiſe the Indians; but when a Biſhop is wanted, and chriſtianiſing the Indians can be uſed as an argument for his miſſion, it at once becomes the great work of this Society; and they, in diſtinction from all others, muſt engage in it as their inviolable duty. And I will ſuppoſe it to be their buſineſs, for I really believe it is, and in virtue of their Charter, however inatten-

tive

tive they may have been to this part of the truſt that has been committed to them. And what follows herefrom? The argument goes on.

"THERE are ſo many plans and propoſals, ſo many different opinions in different perſons, and ſuch a number of difficulties ariſing, in regard of this work of chriſtianiſing the Indians, that there is a neceſſity for one ſuper-intending direction; and who ſo proper for this as a Biſhop? Sir William Johnſon's experience in, and careful attention to, Indian-affairs, may make him the beſt qualified perſon for a Political ſuper-intendant; but, as the great end in view is the advancement and propagation of the chriſtian religion, there muſt evidently appear a peculiar propriety in carrying on the work under the direction of a Biſhop". To all which the anſwer is, If a Biſhop was now reſident in the Colonies, it is queſtionable whether it would be fit to entruſt him with this ſuper-intending power. He might, as he ought to, be better qualified for this office than any other Clergy-man; but a Biſhop cannot do every thing. If the care of all the Epiſcopal-Clergy is committed to him, this, one would think, is, in all reaſon, full work enough for him, if not a great deal too much. He would not find it an eaſie matter to perform it with fidelity. This ſuper-intending buſineſs might therefore, to better purpoſe, be put into other hands. The Society in Scotland, for the propagation of chriſtian knowledge, appoint Commiſſioners, and from the Laity as well as Clergy, to conduct and manage their affairs, when at a diſtance, and not within reach of their own immediate inſpection. The honorable Company for the propagation of the goſpel in New-England, and places adjacent

adjacent in America, have, from the beginning of their incorporation, acted upon the ſame plan, and thouſands of the poor Indians, in execution of it, have been chriſtianiſed. They have, at this day, within the Maſſachuſetts-Province, under the ſuper-intending direction of their Commiſſioners, ſixteen Clergy-men, Engliſh and Indian, ſtatedly labouring, either as Paſtors of ſo many Indian-Churches, or as Preachers to aſſemblies of Indians that meet together for divine worſhip; nine Engliſh Lecturers, and ſeven ſtated School-maſters, beſides occaſional ones. They have likewiſe a Miſſionary in the Mohawk Country, and an Interpreter who has been ſupported at Ohonoquague from a boy on purpoſe to learn their language, which he can now ſpeak with as much freedom as any of the Indians, and with vaſtly more propriety. This young man is alſo a School-maſter to the children in that Indian town. It may be feared, the other Society in England will never accompliſh any great things, unleſs upon a plan of a like nature. It is heartily wiſhed this Society would, in good earneſt, engage in the affair of Goſpeliſing the Indians, and that they would be thorow in it, not merely to promote a party-intereſt, or to favor the deſign of ſettling an Epiſcopate here; but purely to extend the knowledge of the way to ſalvation though Jeſus Chriſt, the only Savior of men. It may be feared, whether, in what is propoſed to be done by the Society, a regard to the Church, as eſtabliſhed in England, may not be too much mingled with the common cauſe of Chriſtianity.

I SHALL not think it impertinent to add here, "as America is the region wherein the divine

goodneſs has been more remarkably diſplayed in favor of the Britiſh Nation"; ſo Americans are the proper perſons to erect "ſome ſutable monument of religious gratitude" on this account. And what more ſutable one, than a viſible perpetually ſtanding teſtimony of their pious concern, and earneſt care, to ſpread the knowledge of that only Lord who has done ſuch great things for them? The Non-epiſcopal Clergy and Laity, in the Maſſachuſetts-Province, were ſo filled with a ſenſe of the peculiar fitneſs of expreſſing their gratitude to heaven in this way, that they voluntarily and liberally contributed, upon the concluſion of the late war, towards the immediate ſupport of two Miſſionaries in the MOHAWK-Country; who were accordingly ſent, and ſo far ſucceeded in their labors, that the Indians deſired to have a Church gathered, and to have the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper adminiſtred to them. And, upon diſcourſing with them with this view, it was found that a number of them were well indoctrinated in the eſſential principles of Chriſtianity, and had upon their minds an uniform practical ſenſe of religion. A ſchool alſo was ſet up for the inſtruction of their children. But, beſides this proviſion for the preſent, they were zealouſly deſirous of having a perpetually continuing one. In order to this, two thouſand pounds ſterling were ſubſcribed, in a week, in the town of Boſton, upon condition there might be an incorporated Society among our ſelves for the conducting and managing this important affair. An incorporating act was prepared, and paſſed by the ſeveral branches of the Government here, and ſent home for the Royal ſanction, without which it could not

not continue in force. But it ſoon met with a Negative, by which means this whole money was loſt, and as much more we had good reaſon to expect would ſoon have been ſubſcribed, beſides the income of many hundred pounds ſterling that had been devoted to the ſervice of the Indians. The Public will judge, whether it was not hard, ſeverely hard, to be reſtrained from making uſe of our own money in carrying on ſo good a work as that of chriſtianiſing the Indians; eſpecially, as it was intended as a "monument of gratitude" to heaven for the marvellous diſplay of it's goodneſs to us in the late war. We eſteemed this hardſhip the greater, as, but a few years before, an incorporating act was confirmed at home, though upon a good deſign, yet upon a far leſs important one. And we ſhould eſteem the hardſhip much greater ſtill, if, in any meaſure, it was brought upon us by EPISCOPAL influence. I will not too poſitively ſay that it was; but this I will ſay, and in the words of a letter from home, wrote by a Gentleman that well underſtood what he was about; "There is reaſon to think, that "an account of your proceedings [relative to the "incorporating act] was ſent to LAMBETH, as "early as to———. The A—h-B—p was pre-"judiced with a notion, that the Society had re-"fuſed to admit the Epiſcopalians at Boſton to "ſubſcribe to the undertaking. [This was an "abſolute falſehood.] The umbrage taken at "this new Society was ſuch, that any the leaſt "attempt to take ſubſcriptions here would have "blown up the ſuſpicions of the CHURCH, and "of the SOCIETY FOR PROPAGATING THE GOS-"PEL, into an open flame againſt it. What could

" be done at the board of trade—has labored to " do—But it ſoon appeared to be a deſperate " cauſe". We have had other accounts to the like purpoſe ; and have no reaſon to think, they are ill-grounded : But whether they are, or are not, it is put out of our power to erect as " proper a monument of gratitude to heaven" as would be done, ſhould there be the ſettlement even of an Epiſcopate.

ANSWER

ANSWER to SECTION VIII. in which the Plan, on which alone American Biſhops have been requeſted, is fairly ſtated, with Expoſtulations on the Reaſonableneſs thereof.

THE repetitions, with which the Dr. begins this ſection, and in conſequence of which he hopes for the attention of his ſuperiors, and the ſettlement of an American-Epiſcopate, have been already conſidered. One thing he has mentioned, previous to his introducing the plan upon this head, it may not be amiſs to take ſome notice of. It is in theſe words, "Will not the complaints "of near a million of Britiſh ſubjects in America, "of unimpeached loyalty and fidelity, who are "ſuffering under the moſt unprecedented hard-"ſhips with regard to religion, an intereſt dearer "than property, and more inviolable than civil "liberty, be regarded, and procure the redreſs of "ſo intolerable a grievance"? He had before ſaid, pag. 45. that "the Church of England in America contains near a million of members"; and repeated it again, pag. 81; * though there is no reaſon

* About the time of writing the above, there appeared in one of our Public papers, a Copy of the Petition that was ſent, by a number of the Epiſcopal-Clergy, to the univerſity

reaſon to think, as has been before obſerved, there is one third part of this number on the American-Continent, and not ſo much as a thirtieth in all the Colonies to the northward of Maryland, which are much the moſt populous, and bid fair to be ſtill more ſo, as they increaſe with much the greateſt rapidity. We are now told of the "COMPLAINTS of this nearly a million of Britiſh ſubjects". If they have complained, their complaints have been kept ſecret in their own breaſts, and not divulged to

univerſity of Cambridge; which, as it agreed with other copies that had been ſeen, and contained nothing in it that has been excepted againſt, may be looked upon as genuine. And, in this view of it, I would obſerve, that "the people belonging to the Church of England, in America", are ſaid "to be more than a million". This differs from the Dr's account, which is, "near a million". But inſtead of charging theſe accounts with inconſiſtency, I would rather ſay, they may both be equally true; the number may be "near a million", or "more than a million", juſt as the Epiſcopalians pleaſe, if the NEGROE-SLAVES are reckoned; for, as the Dr. has told us, "they were found, in the ſurvey that was made, in 1762, to be eight hundred and forty four thouſand". So that, by only greatning or leſſening the number of theſe NEGROES, the "members of the Church" will be either "near", or quite, or "more than a million"; though, if they are not reckoned, [and it would be to an high degree ſhameful to attempt to reckon them] the number of Epiſcopalians will be at once decreaſed many hundred thouſands.—It is farther ſaid, in the next paragraph, "the extent of inhabited Country which hath hitherto, with reſpect to Epiſcopacy, been neglected, is ſome thouſands of miles". Has not this declaration, ſimply as it ſtands, a tendency to lead ſtrangers into a wrong conception of the inhabitants of this extent, as to their religious denomination? It is indeed true, that this "extent is ſome thouſands

to the world. So far as we may judge by the PETITIONS that have been sent home, the Episcopal-Clergy ONLY are the complainers. They are certainly the only persons, we have heard of, who have made any stir about the want of Bishops; and had not they discovered a restless frame of mind, upon this account, no body else would: Nor, so far as I can learn, are there any considerable numbers, to whom they have been able to propagate their uneasiness of spirit. Some of the most respectable Episcopalians, in these parts, for sobriety, good sense, and a steady attachment to the interest of the Church of England, have declared it to be their opinion, that Bishops would be of no service here, and that they did not desire they should be sent. And it is to me, as well as to many I have conversed with upon this head, Episcopalians among others, very questionable, whether, if the members of the Church of England, in these northern

lands of miles"; but it is as true, as to it's one half, that not a thirtieth part of the inhabitants are Episcopalians; and, as to the other half, that their number will be vastly lessened, when a deduction has been made, as it ought to be, of the other denominations, together with those who profess no religion, and are equally indifferent to every mode in which it is exercised. It would have been but fair, if some hint, at least, of this kind had been suggested. As the passage now stands, those, to whom the petition was sent, would naturally be led to think, that the inhabitants, through this large extent, were mostly, if not wholly, professors of the Church of England: Though the Petitioners themselves knew, if they had entertained this idea of them, it would not, in any tolerable degree, have consisted with truth. It may, I believe, be justly said, if there had been more simplicity, and less art, in the wording this petition, it would not have been so exceptionable as it now is.

ern Colonies, were to give in their votes, and to do it without previous Clerical influence, they would be found to be on the ſide of an American-Epiſcopate.—As to the "moſt unprecedented hardſhips, and intolerable grievances" this "million of Britiſh ſubjects are ſuffering with regard to religion", they are, as we have ſeen, nothing more than theſe;—that they are not favored with the enjoyment of that "diſcipline, the reſtoration of which cannot RATIONALLY be attempted by thoſe in authority", and which, if "much reverenced by any, they would be eſteemed WRONG-HEADED, or MEAN-SPIRITED, or BOTH": That though ordination cannot be obtained without going to England for it; yet that they have good friends there, who will lighten, if not totally take off, this burden, by bearing themſelves the expence ariſing therefrom: And, in fine, that they put the Society at home at a vaſt expence of charity, without which the Epiſcopal Churches, in many of the Colonies, would be in danger of ſoon dropping into Non-exiſtence. And notwithſtanding this groundleſs clamor of "unſufferable hardſhips, and intolerable grievance", the Church of England in America has had more and greater favors beſtowed on it, than any other denomination of chriſtians here; yea, than all of them put together: And it may alſo, I believe, with ſtrict truth, be affirmed, that no religious profeſſors, in any Colonies on the face of the earth, have been ſo kindly and charitably encouraged, helped, and, I may ſay, upheld in being.

I NOW proceed to take into conſideration the PROPOSED PLAN for an American-Epiſcopate. It is as follows.

"THAT

" THAT the Biſhops to be ſent to America ſhall " have no authority, but purely of a ſpiritual and " Eccleſiaſtical nature, ſuch as is derived altogether " from the Church, and not from the ſtate—That " this authority ſhall operate only upon the Clergy " of the Church, and not upon the Laity, nor " Diſſenters of any denominations—That the Bi- " ſhops ſhall not interfere with the property, or " privileges, whether civil or religious, of Church- " men or Diſſenters—That, in particular, they " ſhall have no concern with the Probate of Wills, " letters of Guardian-ſhip and Adminiſtration, or " Marriage-licences, nor be judges in any caſes " relating thereto—But, that they ſhall only ex- " erciſe the original powers of their offices, as be- " fore ſtated, i e. ordain and govern the Clergy, " and adminiſter confirmation to thoſe who ſhall " deſire it".

BEFORE I come to the objections we have to make to this plan, I would previouſly interpoſe one thing, weighty in itſelf, and of ſpecial importance to thoſe, who have been employed in contriving, and opening, it to the world. It is this. They have given no evidence, that they were authoriſed to this buſineſs; and, in meddling with what they were not duly called to, they have acted in direct violation of as expreſs an article as any in the eſtabliſhed orders of the Church of England. Let it be obſerved here,

THE Dr. introduces this plan with ſaying, " it has long been ſettled by our friends and ſuperiors at home, and the Clergy of this Country have often ſignified their intire approbation and acquieſcence therein". And again, when he had wrote the plan

for publication, he adds, "this, without any reservation or equivocation, is the exact plan of an American Episcopate, which has been settled at home". It is truly extraordinary, that Episcopalians should tell us of a SCHEME for the mission of Bishops to the Colonies settled at home, and approbated by the Clergy of the Church of England here, to the intire neglect of his MAJESTY, the acknowledged SUPREME HEAD of their Church, without whom there can be not only no settlement of a plan, refering to any Ecclesiastical affair whatever; but no authority so much as to ATTEMPT to form one. It is justly presumed, if his Majesty had been in view, when it was said of this plan, "that it has long been settled by our friends and superiors at home", the manner of diction would have been more expressive of dutiful reverence and subjection; at least, some intimation would have been given of the ROYAL LICENCE to act in this matter. But, instead of this, a plan is mentioned, and published to the world as a settled one, without so much as an hint of any COMMUNICATED AUTHORITY from his MAJESTY to this purpose; which is really strange, especially if considered as done by those who may reasonably be supposed to be well acquainted with the constitution of their own Church, and the vast extent of the King's supremacy over it. Even the CONVOCATION, when convened by the King's writ, have no authority to settle any plan without his consent, nor indeed so much as to ATTEMPT to form one without HIS LICENCE. In the year, 1722, the upper house refused to act upon a declaration sent to them from the lower house, for this reason in special, "that without a ROYAL LICENCE, they had no authority to ATTEMPT, enact, PROMULGE, or execute any Canon,

Canon, by whatever name it might be called, which ſhould concern either doctrine or diſcipline". * And yet, a plan has been PRIVAETLY formed "by ſome friends and ſuperiors at home", and "APPROBATED by the Epiſcopal-Clergy here", and in CONVENED BODIES for the purpoſe; which plan is now publiſhed to the world, and objectors invited to propoſe their objections, if they have any, to be tryed at the tribunal of the Public. Is this manner of conduct, in any degree, conformable to the conſtituted order of the Church of England? Dare Biſhops, or even Arch-Biſhops, at home, venture upon a method of acting ſo repugnant to that SUPREMACY in all Eccleſiaſtical matters, with which, by repeated acts of Parliament, the CROWN has been veſted? It cannot eaſily be accounted for, that it ſhould be ventured upon in the Colonies. Surely, a Plan for an Epiſcopate thus formed, ſettled and publiſhed, ought to have no great regard paid to it. Whatever "ſuperiors at home"

* Calamy's abridgement, vol. I. pag. 639. This refuſal of the upper houſe, for the given reaſon, perfectly agrees, with what was enacted by the ſtatute, 25th Henry 8. called the act of ſubmiſſion, decreeing 1. That the convocation ſhould, from thenceforth, be aſſembled only by the *King's writ*. 2. That it ſhould make no Canons or conſtitutions, but by the *King's licence*, firſt given them ſo to do. 3. That having agreed on any Canons or conſtitutions, they ſhould neither PUBLISH, nor execute them, without the *King's confirmation*. Nor 4. By his authority, execute any but with certain limitations.—Wake's appeal, &c. pag. 4. as cited by the diſſenting Gentleman, pag. 251. Vid. alſo Burn's Eccleſiaſtical law, under the word, convocation; where theſe particulars are mentioned as the purport of this ſtatute, in the opinion of two chief Juſtices, and divers other Juſtices, at a Committee before the Lords in Parliament.

may have had an hand in contriving and ſettling this plan, whether they were Biſhops, or Arch-Biſhops, and how "often ſoever" it may have been "approbated by the Epiſcopal-Clergy in this Country", it is, in reality, nothing more than their private ſentiments concerning the matter; and to publiſh theſe as "a ſettled approbated Plan" muſt appear, to all capable judges, an inſtance of no ſmall preſumption: Eſpecially, if it be remembered, that this is done in direct violation of an expreſs Canon of the Church of England, guarded with a very heavy penalty; which the Dr. and thoſe who put him upon publiſhing this plan, may do well to conſider. The Canon, I have in view, is the LXXIIId, which ordains and conſtitutes, "that no Prieſts, or miniſters of God's word, nor "any other perſons, ſhall meet together in any "private houſe, or elſewhere, to conſult upon any "matter or courſe to be taken by them, or upon "their motion, or direction by any others, which "may any way tend to the impeaching, or de-"praving of the doctrine of the Church of Eng-"land, or of the book of common prayer, or of "any part of the government or diſcipline now e-"ſtabliſhed in the Church of England, under pain "of excommunication, ipſo facto". It will not be diſputed, that there has been "the meeting to-gether" of ſome of the Epiſcopal-Clergy, ſuperior or inferior, or both, at home, or in this Country, "in private houſes, or elſewhere, to conſult upon a courſe", yea, to form a Plan, for altering the "government and diſcipline of the Church of England" in the Colonies; which, in true meaning, and reality of conſtruction, is a practical "impeachment" of it; and greatly aggravated, as this plan, thus privately formed, has been publiſhed to

the

the world for them to judge of it's reaſonableneſs. The fact itſelf is too flagrant to need any proof; and we ſhall have occaſion, by and by, to ſhew, that the planned and publiſhed alteration ESSENTIALLY breaks in upon the conſtituted government and diſcipline of the Church of England. How the framers and publiſhers of the ſcheme for this alteration can reconcile their conduct with the above-cited Canon, they are beſt able to ſay. In the mean time it behoves them to think, whether, by the conſtitution of their own Church, they are not eſteemed excommunicated perſons.

I MIGHT now be reaſonably excuſed from taking any further notice of this Plan, as it is, not only deſtitute of all authority, but comes handed to conſideration in evident contradiction to it. However, I will go on, and diſtinctly mention the objections we have to make againſt it. And, as "the friends of the Church, to uſe the Dr's words, pag. 111. are deſirous to know what can be ſaid, or ſuggeſted, againſt an American Epiſcopate, in the form wherein it is propoſed to ſettle it", and have "requeſted thoſe who have any thing to offer, to confine themſelves to this particular point", I ſhall endeavour their gratification; and the rather, that they might not have it to ſay, "the objections are not to the purpoſe", as not being againſt the plan that was propoſed.

OBJECT. I. The government and diſcipline of the Church of England, under the propoſed American Epiſcopate, is injurious, both to the Church, and the Biſhops that are to preſide over it.

IT is injurious to the Church. One of the grand pleas, in favor of the miſſion of Biſhops to the Colonies,

lonies, has all along been, the "lamentably wretched ſtate" of the Epiſcopal Churches in being "without government and diſcipline" for want of them; and yet, according to this Plan, "the authority of Biſhops", if they are ſent, "ſhall operate only on the Clergy, not the Laity", even of the members of the Church of England. We are fully ſatisfied with that part of the Plan, which limits their authority within the bounds of the Epiſcopal Churches, and provides for it's "not operating upon other denominations of chriſtians". This we think is highly reaſonable. But why ſhould the government of theſe Biſhops be confined to the Clergy of the Church of England? Why may not it's Laity alſo be favored with the benefit of their governing authority? If thisChurch is in ſuffering circumſtances, in point of government and diſcipline for want of Biſhops, and to ſo great a degree as to juſtifie the complaint of "unprecedented hardſhip, intolerable grievance", why ſhould not the Laity, as well as Clergy, be relieved by their miſſion? Are it's Clergy it's only members that need government and diſcipline? Are they, beyond all others, inclined to vice, or diſorderly in their conduct? It is to be hoped, this is not the real truth: Or if it was, it would not be a juſtification of this part of the Plan. For, if government in the hands of Biſhops is an inſtitution of Chriſt, and intended for the benefit of the Church, including the Laity, as well as the Clergy, why is this diſtinction made? What imaginable good reaſon can be given, why the former, as truly as the latter, ſhould not be partakers of this benefit? By the conſtitution of the Engliſh Church, the Laity as well as Clergy are put under the governing care of Biſhops; and their authority,

rity, at home, extends to both, to the one as truly as to the other. And why ſhould not the Epiſcopal-Coloniſts enjoy the ſame happy privilege? The plain truth is, they are hardly treated in this Plan. They are not merely neglected; but, what is much worſe, expreſs proviſion is made that they ſhall be excluded the benefit of the governing authority of their Biſhops. Is this reaſonable? Will they, will the world, think it is?

It is injurious to the Biſhops alſo it is propoſed ſhould be ſent to theColonies. They are, in a meer arbitrary manner, reſtrained in the exerciſe of that authority, which, in the judgment of theſe very Planners, properly belongs to them both by apoſtolic appointment, and the conſtitution of the Church of England. Why then ſhould they be deprived of one half of that, which is their juſt right? If it is fit, they ſhould be allowed the exerciſe of their authority in the government of the Epiſcopal-laity at home, why not in America? What good reaſon can be aſſigned for making this wide difference? If Biſhops are ſent hither, the Laity of the Epiſcopal Churches are as properly the objects of their government, as the Clergy; and, if they are conſidered either as officers of Chriſt, or of the Church of England, it as truly belongs to them to exerciſe a governing authority over the one as the other. The limitation of their power, propoſed in the Plan, is therefore an unreaſonable invaſion of their juſt right as Biſhops; yea, if the government of the Church, as the Dr. has endeavoured to prove, is lodged by Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, with ſuch Biſhops as he would have ſent to America, will it not favour of ſpiritual robbery to deprive them of it in any part? And

why

why ſhould any attempt to do ſo? What ſpecial end the formers of this Plan might have in their view, by thus limiting their Biſhops authority, I am not able to ſay. It is not eaſie to conceive what advantage they could propoſe to gain hereby. But, whatever their end was, they have certainly laid their American Biſhops under reſtraints, in regard of governing authority, that are injurious to them as well as the Laity, as they do not allow them the exerciſe of thoſe rights, which, they themſelves think, properly belong to them, as officers in the kindom of Chriſt.

Object. II. The Biſhops, in this plan, are ſo widely different from the Biſhops of the Church of England at home, that it is not reaſonable they ſhould be either deſired, or ſent. The Biſhops, propoſed for the Colonies, beſides being reſtrained in the exerciſe of their authority to the Clergy only, are to be ſtript of all that civil power, which is, in England, annexed to their eccleſiaſtical. And, if we may depend on the Dr's word, they are, moreover, to have no SPIRITUAL COURTS. For he ſays, pag. 95. "if our American Biſhops are to have no authority over diſſenters, nor indeed to exerciſe diſcipline over our own people, the Clergy excepted; then the frightful objection of *ſpiritual courts* intirely vaniſhes. For if no authority of this kind will be claimed, or exerciſed by them, we may be ſure that no Courts will be erected for the exerciſe of it". What kind of Biſhops are here provided for the Colonies? How amazingly different from the Biſhops at home? Is it reaſonable to expect the miſſion of ſuch? I may rather ſay, is it reaſonable ſo much as to deſire their miſſion? Have not the

Diſſenters

Diſſenters in England been complaining for more than an hundred years of the difficulties and hardſhips, ariſing from the unnatural junction of civil and ſpiritual powers in theſe Church-officers? Yea, have not Epiſcopalians themſelves, Biſhops as well as others of inferior rank, joined with them in ardent wiſhes, and importunate intreaties, for a change in the ſpiritual courts, at leaſt as to their manner of adminiſtration? And ſhall a comparative handful of Epiſcopal profeſſors, moſt of whom, in many of the Colonies, are ſo inſufficient, as that they are upheld in being, with reſpect to their religious denomination, at the charitable expence of a diſtant Society; I ſay, ſhall theſe imagine themſelves ſo important, as that, for their ſakes, the powers and appendages of Biſhops ſhall be ſo mightily abridged? Surely, the whole body of Diſſenters in England, and a very conſiderable part of the eſtabliſhed Church there, are as well worthy of the national attention; and it is as fit, their requeſts, often repeated, ſhould be anſwered. When this is done, it will be time, and not before, to expect that this plan ſhould be conſidered, and bro't into effect.

Not that we object againſt the propoſed abridgment of the power of Biſhops as unreaſonable in itſelf. We think, on the contrary, it is a wiſe and equitable alteration; and heartily wiſh, that theſe appendages, quite extraneous to the office of Biſhops, and greatly prejudicial to the faithful execution of it, may no more be united with it. The ſooner they are disjoined, and forever ſeparated, the better. It would, we apprehend, tend greatly to promote the good of the Church of Chriſt. But what we object is, the partiality of the propoſal;

it's being confined to the Colonies, and not extended to the Mother-country. For if this planned reſtraint is reaſonable in itſelf, it is as reaſonable it ſhould take place *there*, as *here*; and to deſire it *here* upon any other plan than ſuch an extenſive one as ſhall operate in England, as well as America, appears to us inconſiſtent and abſurd.

It may deſerve conſideration, as uniformity is one of the main things aimed at in the conſtitution of the Church of England, whether it would comport with this deſign to make the propoſed difference between Biſhops here and at home? Are they not officers of one and the ſame Church, and of equal rank and degree? Why then ſhould they be thus veſted with different powers? How diſſimilar would be the appearance of ſuch Biſhops? Would it not hurt, if not quite deſtroy the Church's uniformity, in regard of it's officers? And what muſt we think of a conſtitution, that would clothe preciſely the ſame officers of the ſame Church, not with the ſame, but with widely differing powers? Would it argue conſiſtent regularity in the conſtitution?

It ought to be conſidered yet farther, if Biſhops ſhould be ſent to the Colonies with theſe reſtrained powers, whether undeſirable conſequences might not be naturally feared, both *here*, and at *home*?

Would it be unreaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the Biſhops *here* would be diſpoſed to throw off this reſtraint as ſoon as might be? Would it be any other than what has been done a thouſand times over, if they ſhould embrace all opportunities, in the vigorous uſe of all likely means to recover theſe

theſe appendages to their office they have been deprived of? Would it not be a good plea in their favour, that they aimed at nothing more, than being upon a par with their brethern in the ſame office? HaveBiſhops, in the ſeveral paſt ages of the Church, diſcovered ſuch want of ambition, and ſo great a diſinclination to the enlargement of their ſphere of power, as to render it in the leaſt degree improbable, that they would act in the manner that has been deſcribed? Nay, the Dr. himſelf has been ſo off his guard, as even to ſuggeſt, * that, in time to come, they "may be veſted with ſuch a degree of civil power, as may be worthy of their acceptance", and to juſtifie the thing itſelf. What he has ſaid, upon this head, may be conſidered in it's proper place.

And, at *home*, would there be no likelyhood of uneaſineſs, in conſequence of an American Epiſcopate upon this plan? Might not the vaſt numbers there, who have long complained of the too largely extended power claimed and exerciſed by Biſhops, think themſelves hardly treated, that no regard ſhould be paid to their intreaties, while a comparatively few inconſiderable profeſſors of the Church of England in America are heard, and an Epiſcopate ſettled for them according to their mind? And would even the Biſhops themſelves at home be pleaſed with the propoſed limitation of the authority of Biſhops here? Would they not eaſily and naturally argue from what was done in the Colonies, to what might, with as much reaſon, be done in England? If Biſhops in America may be as faithful in their office, and do their duty as well, without ſpiritual courts and civil

* Pag. 110.

power, as with them, what need of theſe annexed appendages at home? Why may not Biſhops there be as reaſonably reſtrained in their authority, as Biſhops in the Colonies? It can ſcarce be ſuppoſed it ſhould eſcape the thought of our Engliſh Biſhops, that the ſettlement of ſuch an Epiſcopate in America, as is here propoſed, may prepare the way for ſuch a change in the power of Biſhops at home, as they would not be very fond of.

I SHALL not think it unneceſſary, before I leave this objection, to obſerve, that not only the Dr. but the Clergy that deſired him to write, and their ſuperiors at home alſo, ſeem to be united in the thought, that, if Biſhops are ſent to the Colonies, it would be reaſonable they ſhould be ſuch, as they have deſcribed, that is, Biſhops diveſted of all power but that, which they call "purely ſpiritual": Otherwiſe, they would not have been at the pains to prepare, and publiſh their plan of an American Epiſcopate. We all as one join with them in this ſentiment. If Biſhops are ſent to the Colonies with civil as well as ſpiritual powers, and claim it as their right to concern themſelves here, as they do at home, with the Probate of Wills, letters of Guardian-ſhip and Adminiſtration, holding their courts, and acting as judges in matters of this nature, it would introduce an eſſential change in the ſettled conſtitution of the Colonies upon this head, and vacate all their laws relative thereto. And this is an alteration that would affect all denominations among us, Epiſcopalians in common with others; inſomuch, that they themſelves would not deſire Biſhops ſhould come here veſted with ſuch power. It is not ſuppoſed, there are a ſcore of this denomination, in all the Colonies, who would be

be gratified with ſo deſtructive an eſtabliſhment. It would, without all controverſie, be the occaſion of univerſal confuſion. Inſtead of that peace and quiet we now enjoy, there would be noiſe and clamor, anger, wrath, ſtrife, and all manner of diſtraction: Eſpecially would this be the conſequence, if theſe Biſhops, in the exerciſe of their authority, ſhould interfere with the religious liberties and privileges of other denominations. Theſe their fathers purchaſed for them at a very dear rate, theſe they value as their deareſt intereſt, and, rather than be deprived of them, they would chearfully ſubmit to the loſs even of life itſelf. It is not therefore imagined by Epiſcopalians, any more than other denominations, that this kind of Biſhops will be thought proper for the Colonies; nor can it be ſuppoſed, they will be ever ſent, unleſs a change in the ſtate of affairs at home ſhould unhappily take place, that will be as detrimental to them, as it will be to us.

OBJECT. III. The Church of England knows no ſuch Biſhops as are ſpecified in this plan, nor can they, in conſiſtency with it's conſtitution, be ſent to the Colonies. The American Biſhops, ſays the Plan, "ſhall have no authority but purely of a ſpiritual and eccleſiaſtical nature, ſuch as is ALTOGETHER FROM THE CHURCH, NOT FROM THE STATE"; that is, in plain Engliſh, they ſhall have no authority at all as officers in the Church of England.

IF by this "purely ſpiritual authority" is meant, authority that has for it's object ONLY the concerns of religion, and the ſouls of men, it is acknowledged, it may be thus confined. This was the

the only authority of Biſhops, whether we underſtand the word in the Epiſcopalian ſenſe, or our's, in apoſtolic times, and afterwards, until Conſtantine became a chriſtian by profeſſion. And it would have been happy for the Church of Chriſt, if civil power had never been annexed to that office, which has nothing to do but with the ſpiritual intereſts of men. But then, it is to be remembered, that this authority, at leaſt as to it's exerciſe in the Church of England, is not ALTOGETHER FROM THE CHURCH, and NOT FROM THE STATE; nor can this be the caſe, conformably to it's preſent eſtabliſhment. Is not the KING the acknowledged SUPREME HEAD of this Church? Does it own any for Biſhops, or can there be any, without his licence for their election, and nominating the perſons that ſhall be choſen? And when they have been elected and conſecrated, can they exerciſe the leaſt authority, even in ſpiritual and eccleſiaſtical matters, but by him, and within the limits that have been pointed out to them by the STATE? Can they vary a title from it's preſcribed orders in any one thing pertaining to the exerciſe of authority? Are they not obliged to the uſe of thoſe forms of prayer, that mode of ordination, and that manner of adminiſtring the ſacrament, the STATE has enjoined? Is there any one part of government or diſcipline they can depart from, or alter? How then ſhould their "authority be ALTOGETHER from the CHURCH, not from the STATE"? Can that authority, with any ſhew of reaſon, have this affirmed of it, which cannot be obtained without the intervening pleaſure of the KING, and, when obtained, cannot be exerciſed but within certain limits, which have been aſcertained by the STATE?

To

To ſpeak of that authority as ALTOGETHER from the CHURCH, which is ſo eſſentially dependent on the STATE, that it cannot be had but in compliance with the laws it has made, nor exerciſed but in conformity to them, is highly inconſiſtent. It is indeed this dependance on the STATE, notwithſtanding the deſired authority ALTOGETHER from the CHURCH, that is the true ſource of all the hardſhips and grievances, on account of the want of Biſhops in America, that have been ſo bitterly complained of. Did Biſhops of the Church of England no more depend on the STATE, and no more derive their authority from it, than our miniſters do, the Epiſcopal Churches here might as well be ſupplied with Biſhops, as our's are with Paſtors. What ſhould hinder? The Apoſtles in their day, and their ſucceſſors afterwards for many years, were veſted with ſpiritual powers, and exerciſed them, according to the inſtitution of Chriſt, without the intervening help of any civil ſtate whatever. And why may not the officers of God's ſpiritual kingdom now be veſted with like powers, and go on in the exerciſe of them, in the ſame way? Our Epiſcopalian Coloniſts make ſome pretences to this, while they ſay, the Biſhops they propoſe ſhould be ſent to America "ſhall have no authority but ſuch as is ALTOGETHER FROM THE CHURCH"; but what a vain pretence is this? How abſurd? when they know that Biſhops can have no authority in the Church of England, but from the STATE? If they may be veſted with authority, it cannot be exerciſed, as officers in this Church, but from the KING, and ALTOGETHER conformably to the ORDERS of the STATE. If it had been only ſaid, the Colony-Biſhops ſhall have no other than *purely ſpiritual* authority, nor exerciſe any other, this would

would have been intelligible and conſiſtent; but to propoſe that they ſhould have this authority not at all from the STATE, as muſt be the caſe if it is ALTOGEHER FROM THE CHURCH, is to propoſe that which is incompatible with the KING'S SUPREMACY in all ſpiritual and eccleſiaſtical matters, and ſubverſive of that STATE-POWER, by which the Church of England has been eſtabliſhed. It cannot therefore be ſuppoſed, but that this part of the plan ſhould be rejected, both by the King and Parliament.

OBJECT. IV. We are, in principle, againſt all civil eſtabliſhments in religion; and as we do not deſire any ſuch eſtabliſhment in ſupport of our own religious ſentiments, or practice, we cannot reaſonably be blamed, if we are not diſpoſed to encourage one in favor of the Epiſcopal-Coloniſts. We profeſs to "fear God, and honor the King"; declaring our readineſs to obey, in ſubordination to the allegience we owe to him who has been conſtituted "Head over all things", the "powers ordained of God" to bear rule over us. We acknowledge, with humble gratitude, the favor of our rightful Sovereign, in allowing us the enjoyment of thoſe "liberties, wherewith Chriſt has made his diſciples free"; though we judge, at the ſame time, and upon ſolid reaſon, as we imagine, that we have a juſt right to think for our ſelves in matters of religion, and, in conſequence of this right, to worſhip God in that way, which, we apprehend, will be moſt acceptable to him; and while we do this, "leading quiet and peaceable lives, in all godlineſs and honeſty", we think farther, we have a claim to the protection of the State, and the benefit of thoſe laws it has made, or

reaſonably

reaſonably may make, for the ſecurity of it's loyal ſubjects in the exerciſe of their rights and liberties, whether civil or religious. But we deſire not, and ſuppoſe we have no right to deſire, the interpoſition of the ſtate to eſtabliſh our ſentiments in religion, or the manner in which we would expreſs them. And, as we do not deſire this for our ſelves, it would be hard to expect we ſhould deſire it in behalf of others. It does not indeed appear to us, that God has entruſted the ſtate with a right to make religious eſtabliſhments. If the ſtate in England has this delegated authority, muſt it not be owned, that the ſtate in China, in Turkey, in Spain, has this authority alſo? What ſhould make the difference, in the eye of true reaſon? Hath the ſtate in England been diſtinguiſhed by heaven by any peculiar grant, beyond the ſtate in other Countries? If it has, let the grant be produced. If it has not, all ſtates have, in common, the ſame authority. And as they muſt ſeverally be ſuppoſed to exert this authority in eſtabliſhments conformable to their own ſentiments in religion; what can the conſequence be, but infinite damage to the cauſe of God and true religion? And ſuch in fact has been the conſequence of theſe eſtabliſhments in all ages, and in all places. What abſurdities in ſentiment, and ridiculous follies, not to ſay groſs immoralities, in practice, have not been eſtabliſhed by the civil power in ſome or other of the nations of the earth? Even in chriſtian Countries, ſo called, has not that been eſtabliſhed for the religion of Jeſus, which, for the greater part by far, palpably contradicted the principles of common ſenſe? Has not a power been religiouſly eſtabliſhed in oppoſition to Chriſt, that has exalted itſelf "above all that is called God", and that has filled the earth

with the blood of thoſe, who choſe death, in the moſt hideouſly contrived forms, rather than to pay homage to ſuch an idol of falſe worſhip? Yea, in England itſelf, has not the religion of Chriſt, under popiſh eſtabliſhments, been debaſed, corrupted, and turned into a meer farce? And, ſince the reformation, what has been ſo great an obſtacle to Goſpel-ſimplicity and purity of worſhip, as that eſtabliſhment, which, having once obtained, the ſtrongeſt reaſonings, and moſt earneſt intreaties, have not availed to effect an alteration in it, not ſo much as in acknowledged exceptionable articles? We are not convinced, that religious eſtabliſhments are at all adapted to ſerve the cauſe of truth and virtue; but are rather perſuaded, they have been, and ever will be, greatly detrimental to the prevalence of real genuine Chriſtianity. And as the American Colonies, at leaſt many of them, are, at preſent, free from difficulties and embaraſments by means of ſuch eſtabliſhments, we cannot but hope they will always remain ſo. It ought not to be ſuppoſed, that thoſe Colonies ſhould be fond of an eſtabliſhed Epiſcopate, which were ſettled by ſuch as were driven from their native land by the oppreſſive exerciſe of Prelatical power. We ſhould expreſs but little regard to the memory of our Progenitors, and leſs gratitude for their pious care, in oppoſition to heavier tryals, and greater hardſhips, than we can now eaſily conceive of, to tranſmit religion to us free from all yokes of bondage, if we ſhould encourage the eſtabliſhment of that very power which was ſo injuriouſly harraſſing to them, and may in time be ſo to us.

OBJECT. V. The Church of England in the Colonies, in it's comparative low ſtate, inſtead of an Epiſcopate,

Epiſcopate, upon this plan, or any other, needs rather the charitable aſſiſtance of it's friends to ſupport it's preſent miniſters, and others that are ſtill wanted. In North-Carolina, the religious ſtate of things, by all accounts, is deplorably ſad. The public worſhip of God, in any form, is ſtrangely neglected; and they have few, very few, miniſters to officiate in goſpel-adminiſtrations. That charity, which might be ſufficient for the maintenance of as many Miſſionaries as would be needful there, would be ſwallowed up by one Biſhop only. And would this ſo much tend to the honor of God, and the good of ſouls, as if it was expended in ſupport of Miſſions that are really neceſſary? I ſhall only ſay of Virginia, and Maryland, that it can do them no harm, if we heartily wiſh, that a better and more general regard was paid there to the inſtitutions of Jeſus Chriſt. As to the other Colonies, extending from Penſylvania to the northernmoſt bounds of the Maſſachuſetts-Province, notwithſtanding the pious care of the Society at home, and the vaſt charity they have annually been expending in favor of the Church of England, from their firſt incorporation to this day, it has grown but little in compariſon with the other denominations of chriſtians, not having got as yet beyond it's infant ſtate. Perhaps, there are not more Epiſcopal Churches in theſe Colonies, than there have been thouſands of pounds ſterling expended towards bringing them into exiſtence; and they are, by far the greater part of them, in ſo weak and low a ſtate, that there would be no hope of their continuance in being, if that charity was with-held, which, at firſt, gave it to them: Whereas, the Churches of other denominations, without any charitable help from home, or elſewhere, are become a great mul-

titude, rapidly increaſing in all parts of the Country, in the ſame proportion beyond the Epiſcopal Churches, as they have all along done from the beginning, At the largeſt computation, there are not more than twenty ſix or ſeven thouſand Epiſcopalians in theſe ſeven Colonies, which contain the greateſt number of inhabitants on the American Continent; and of theſe, it would be no wrong to the truth if it ſhould be ſaid, a very conſiderable part went over to the Church, not ſo much upon ſober inquiry and real principle, as from diſguſt at their Pariſh-miniſter, or unhappy prejudices ariſing from the placing of a Meeting-houſe, or ſome ſuch important difficulty in the towns where they lived. In this view of the matter, which is certainly a juſt and true one, what occaſion is there for the miſſion of Biſhops? Eſpecially, as their authority is not to extend to the Epiſcopal Laity. Would it not anſwer much better ends, to beſtow that charity it will require to ſupport Biſhops, in providing for thoſe Churches that muſt come to nothing, if they are not ſupported in this way?

It may be worthy of ſpecial notice here, one great complaint in behalf of the Epiſcopal Churches is, that numbers of them are deſtitute of miniſters. This want of miniſters cannot with more truth and juſtice be attributed to any cauſe, than the want of money for the ſupport of more miſſions. The Society at home, the grand ſource of charitable help, have ſeen fit, of late years, to leſſen their grants in ſupport of their Miſſionaries, for no other reaſon, it is preſumed, than their inability to make larger ones; and to the ſame inability it is, we believe, chiefly owing, that there are no miſſions in the places where they are wanted. And, as

this

this is the caſe, is it prudent to deſire an Epiſcopate, which will be attended with a vaſt charge, which muſt be defrayed ſome way or other? It ſhould ſeem as though it would be time enough to deſire Biſhops, when the Church is able to ſtand upon it's own legs, and to ſupport it's own inferior Clergy, as well as ſuch ſuperior officers as Biſhops. Things are not ripe, as yet, for an Epiſcopate. The Church muſt get ſtronger footing in the Colonies before this may reaſonably be thought of; and there is no probable way, in which it can attain to this ſtrength, but by employing all the pious charity that can be collected for the better ſupporting the preſent Miſſions, and providing for ſtill more: Though after all, it is very queſtionable, whether, even with this help, the Church will ſoon arrive at ſuch a ſtate of maturity, as to make it worth while for a Biſhop to come here.

OTHER objections we have to make againſt the plan that has been propoſed; but as they co-incide with what has been powerfully offered by the late excellent Dr. Mayhew, I ſhall take the liberty to inſert his objections at large. And there may be a ſpecial propriety in this, not only as we eſteem them highly pertinent, and indiſputably valid; but as they were wrote in anſwer to this very plan, which, though exhibited by one "who is ſuppoſed to be an high dignitary of the Church", and declared, by our author, to be ſo harmleſs, in every reſpect, that no reaſonable objections can be offered againſt it", he has yet ſuffered to lie expoſed to all the Dr. has ſaid againſt it, not having liſped a word in reply to him.

BUT, before I preſent the reader, with what Dr. Mayhew has ſaid upon this ſubject, I would briefly ſuggeſt

ſuggeſt one thing, as an expedient well adapted to com-promiſe matters between Epiſcopalians, and other Denominations, in the Colonies, and unite them all in love and peace. It is this; that the King and Parliament, who veſted Biſhops at *home* with governing and ordaining power in the Church of England, may, if in their wiſdom they think fit, lodge the ſame power with Preſbyters *here*. And ſhould they pleaſe to do this, it would inſtantly put an end to the complaint for want of governing and ordaining authority in America. There would now be no need of Biſhops, as Preſbyters might, with as much valid propriety, govern and ordain in the Colonies, as Biſhops in England. For, let it be particularly noticed, what is now ſuggeſted is perfectly agreeable to the principles of the firſt founders of the reformed Church of England. Governing and ordaining power was not given to Biſhops, becauſe it was thought they were an order of officers ſuperior to Preſbyters by DIVINE RIGHT. It was ſuppoſed, that all power in ſpiritual and eccleſiaſtical matters, as well as temporal, was veſted in the KING, who might communicate it to what ſubordinate miniſters he pleaſed It was upon this principle, that the power of ORDINATION was once delegated to Cromwel, a LAYMAN, as the King's vice-gerent; who, in virtue of the King's acknowledged ſupremacy, had then as full legal authority to ordain as any Biſhop in the kingdom. Upon this ſame principle, "Cranmer, "Arch-Biſhop of Canterbury, Bonner, Biſhop of Lon-"don, &c. took out commiſſions from the Crown, "importing, that, becauſe the vicegerent (Crom-"wel, a lay perſon) could not perſonally attend "the charge in all parts of the kingdom, the King "authoriſes the Biſhop in his (the King's) ſtead to ordain,

" ordain, within his Diocefs, ſuch as he judged " worthy of holy orders; to collate to benefices; " to give inſtitution; and to execute all other " parts of the Epiſcopal authority; and this dur- " ing the King's pleaſure only".* As a celebrated writer argues, " from theſe Commiſſions, which " the Biſhops took out, eſpecially Bonner's, Biſhop " of London, it is evident, that all the power of " ORDINATION which the Biſhops had, or could " have and exerciſe in this Kingdom, they derived " entirely from the CIVIL MAGISTRATE, and " *only* from him. And that this really is the caſe " as to *eccleſiaſtical orders* conferred by our PRESENT " Biſhops, that all the validity, ſignificancy or " weight which they have in *this* Church, they " derive *purely* and *ſolely* from the authority of " the MAGISTRATE, inconteſtibly appears from " hence; namely, that the magiſtrate has *autho-* " *ritatively* directed and preſcribed HOW and TO " WHOM, *ordination* is to be given. And ſhould " an ordination be given by all the Biſhops in this " Church in OTHER manner, & OTHER form, than " that preſcribed by the magiſtrate, *ſuch ordina-* " *tion* would be of no legality at all, nor authority " in *this* Church. The man *ſo ordained* would be " no proper miniſter in the Church of England. " A miniſter in the Church of Chriſt, he poſſibly " might be; but he would, I repeat it, be no " miniſter in the Church of England; nor would " have power and authority to officiate as a prieſt " *therein.* —Nor let it be here replied,—that theſe " Biſhops, who by the laws of England are im- " powered to ordain, are at the ſame time to be conſidered

* Vid. Examination of the Codex Juris, pag. 32, 33. as cited by the Diſſent. Gentleman, pag. 24, 25,

" conſidered as *ſucceſſors* of the Apoſtles, and have " received *power of ordination* from theſe founders " of the chriſtian Church by an *uninterrupted lineal* " *deſcent*. For the conſtitution and law of England " knows nothing at all of this; it reſts *not this power*, " which it commits to it's Biſhops, upon any ſuch " *lineal ſucceſſion* or *deſcent* (which it knows to be " a rope of ſand, a ridiculous chimera, a thing " which no man upon earth is able to make out.) " No; but it conſiders the KING, veſted (by act " of Parliament, or the ſuffrage of the people) with " a FULLNESS of ALL *power eccleſiaſtical* in theſe " realms, as *impowering* and *authoriſing* Biſhops to " ordain". * I ſhall ſubjoin here, ſhould this power of ordination, which has been delegated to Biſhops in England, be delegated, by the KING and PARLIAMENT, to Preſbyters in the Colonies, they would have as much authority, as officers in the Church of England, to ordain *here*, as Biſhops have at *home*; and any upon whom they ſhould confer holy orders would be as authentic miniſters of this Church, and their adminiſtrations in it as valid, as if they had been ordained by the laying on of the hands of any Biſhop, or all the Biſhops, in England. I would ſay yet farther, ſuch a conſtitution would much better ſuit the ſtate of the Colonies, than the miſſion of Biſhops; and for the ſame prudential reaſons that governing and ordaining power was veſted in Biſhops, at home, upon the ſettlement of the Church after the reformation, it might be veſted in Preſbyters in this new world. And ſuch a delegation of power would, I will venture to ſay, be far more reaſonable, than the miſſion of Biſhops to the Colonies that " ſhall have no authority over the Laity" of the Epiſcopal Churches. Such Biſhops

* Diſſent. Gentleman's anſwer, to White. pag. 203, 205.

Biſhops are unknown to the Church of England, and to all antiquity. They are, in truth, a thing quite new under the ſun.

WHAT Dr. Mayhew has wrote, in oppoſition to the propoſed Plan for an American Epiſcopate, is as follows. *

"THE gentleman, I muſt own, has, in his ſcheme, ſet this propoſal for American biſhops in a more plauſible, and leſs exceptionable point of view, than I have ſeen it placed in before.—But he is not *known*; nor has he informed us, upon what ground or authority he goes, in giving this account of the matter. The declaration of an *anonymous* writer, how confidently ſoever he may expreſs himſelf, is not, ſurely, ſufficient to ſatisfy us, that this is the *true* ſcheme planned. How much regard ſoever he might juſtly claim, if he were known to be a perſon of that eminence and dignity, which ſome of his expreſſions intimate him to be; yet while this is unknown, he will excuſe us if we do not intirely rely upon his word, that no *other* ſcheme has been propoſed. This may poſſibly be only his own ſcheme, the ſcheme of a private man: And, till it comes from better authority, or in a more authentic way, we may conſider it as an imaginary one, calculated to ſerve a preſent turn, or to lull us into ſecurity as to biſhops here, till, by the *real*, and much more *fatal* ſcheme's being carried into execution, it is too late to remonſtrate.

* Vid. his remarks on an anonymous tract, entitled an anſwer to Dr. Mayhew's obſervations on the charter and conduct of the Society for the propagation of the Goſpel in foreign parts, pag. 59, and onwards.

But let us for the preſent take it for granted, that this gentleman's is the *real* and *only* ſcheme. Let us ſuppoſe, that biſhops are to be *at firſt* ſent to America with ſuch limited powers, to reſide in epiſcopal colonies, and to have no concern, but with epiſcopalians. Have we ſufficient ground to think that they and their ſucceſſors would, to the day of doom, or for a long time, remain contented with ſuch powers, or under ſuch limitations ? in a word, that they would continue ſuch inoffenſive, harmleſs creatures, as this gentleman ſuppoſes ; only diffuſing *bleſſings* around them, on all manner of people *ſuſceptible of ſuch holy impreſſions* as are made by their *hands* on the good people in England ; ſo that we can reaſonably apprehend no miſchief from them ? Has this order of men been remarkable for a quiet, inoffenſive behaviour ? Have they uſually been free from ambitious views and projects ? from a diſpoſition to intermeddle in ſecular, worldly matters, and to enlarge the ſphere of their domination?—from attempts to encroach upon the rights of mankind, religious or civil ? from intriguing with princes, or the governors of countries, for their own advantage ? from lending their aſſiſtance, and joining with them, in carrying on ſchemes of oppreſſion ? Is it natural to ſuppoſe, that American biſhops would long content themſelves in a condition ſo inferior to that of their brethren, the *ſucceſſors* of the apoſtles in England ?—without any of their temporal power and grandeur, ſo as, in the eyes of moſt people, to appear of a lower order ; and conſequently wanting that authority and reſpect which, it might be pleaded, is needful ? Ambition and avarice never want plauſible pretexts to accompliſh their end. The gentleman ſays, he cannot perceive why the people, even

even of New-England, 'might not as ſafely *breath* 'the *ſame air* with a biſhop, as their brethren in 'Old England do. However (as he goes on) we 'are unwilling to diſquiet any of them, by import-'ing and ſettling *amongſt them* a creature, which it 'ſeems ſome of them account to be ſo *noxious*. 'Only we hope, that his occaſionally *travelling* 'through *the country*, cannot *infect* it very danger-'ouſly *.' One, of ſuch a diſpoſition as he propoſes, might not. But what if, inſtead of this, he ſhould be another *Sacheverel?* no impoſſible ſuppoſition! And ſuch a man would probably be the moſt acceptable to the major part of the epiſcopal clergy, if not of the laity, in New-England. Might not *He* be a very *noxious* creature, *infect* the country in *travelling* through it, and diffuſe *plagues* inſtead of *bleſſings*, in his progreſs? What the gentleman ſays upon this head, brings to my mind what I have read of that great church-man: 'When 'the *ſpiritual hydra* began to belch forth his 'poiſon, when the—*prieſt* went his progreſs, *the air* 'was corrupted with his breath, and the fell *contagion* ſpread itſelf far and near. The *ſnakes* which 'had laid long in the graſs, began to ſhow their 'heads, and hiſs; they *ſtung* many and did *much* 'miſchief, &c. †

I AM very remote from ſuſpecting, that this gentleman would think ſuch a perſon a proper one for a biſhop in America, or any where elſe; ſince he appears to be of a very different ſpirit himſelf. And it is intimated by him, that we ſhall have no ground for apprehenſions, ſince biſhops here, if any there are, will be appointed by the crown, and

* P. 66. † A Tract intitled *Prieſtianity*, &c.

intirely dependent on the government in England; that *the ſmalleſt attempts towards an oppreſſive enlargement of ſpiritual power would be immediately cruſhed with indignation by the legiſlature there*; and that *both the moderation of the clergy, and the watchfulneſs of the laity over them* [God be thanked, if it be ſo] *are much more likely to increaſe than diminiſh**. Theſe are good words, and fair ſpeeches; nor do I doubt, but that the gentleman ſpeaks his real ſentiments. But ſuppoſing all this; taking it alſo for granted, that in the *preſent adminiſtration*, there has been a diſcovery of ſo much wiſdom and integrity, of ſuch a great regard to the *liberties* and *priviledges* of the ſubject, and, particularly, of *ſuch a tender concern for the intereſt and proſperity of his Majeſty's American colonies*, as leaves us no room to fear an *oppreſſive enlargement of ſpiritual*, or *any other power*, during the continuance of it: All this being taken for granted, yet may not times alter, and adminiſtrations change? Who knows what the next reign and adminiſtration may be? or whether attempts towards an oppreſſive enlargement of power, may not be as much encouraged, as it is ſuppoſed they would be frowned on, during the preſent? We are certainly much more ſecure againſt ſuch oppreſſion, in the abſence of biſhops, than we ſhould be if they were fixed here. *Obſta principiis*, was never thought an ill maxim by wiſe men. Biſhops being once fixed in America, pretexts might eaſily be found, both for encreaſing their number, and enlarging their powers: And theſe pretexts might probably be hearkened to, and prevail, on ſuch a change of times as may be ſuppoſed. To ſay the leaſt, this is much more to be apprehended, than it is, that, on ſuch a change, biſhops

* P. 65.

ſhops ſhould be ſent hither at firſt with ſuch oppreſſive powers, or powers that interfere with the preſent rights and privileges of the *Coloniſts*. People are not uſually deprived of their liberties all at once, but gradually; by one encroachment after another, *as it is found they are diſpoſed to bear them*; and things of the moſt fatal tendency are often introduced at firſt, under a comparatively plauſible and harmleſs appearance. It cannot therefore be thought ſtrange, if we like the aforeſaid maxim, as to *oppoſing the firſt attempts*, in the preſent caſe; and are deſirous to keep the apprehended evil at as great a diſtance as may be. All prudent men act upon the ſame principle: Nor can I bring myſelf to reaſon as he did, who ſaid, *What hath poſterity done for us, that we ſhould be concerned for poſterity?* And ſhould biſhops be once fixed here, to me it is highly probable, that *our poſterity* would not find it half ſo difficult as this gentleman thinks it is for us now, before the experiment is made, to anſwer his *ſpirited* demands, 'Where are the *perſecutors?* Where 'is the *dragon** ?' Eſpecially if it be true, as many affirm, that *high-church tory-principles* and maxims are lately *revived* in England; and favoured *greatly* by ſome, whoſe influence may go far towards bringing them into as much reputation, as they have been in diſgrace ſince the death of Queen *Anne*.

THE gentleman conſiders as perfectly chimerical, the apprehenſions which I formerly hinted, reſpecting the inconveniences that might reſult from the appointment of biſhops in America. Particularly, that by the increaſe of the epiſcopal party, they might get a majority in our houſes of aſſembly; that in conſequence thereof the church of England might

* P. 65.

might become the eſtabliſhed religion of all theſe colonies; that a ſacramental teſt, or ſomething like it, might enſue, to exclude non-conformiſts from places, preferment, and civil offices *as in England*; and that taxes might be impoſed on us all in common, for the maintenance of theſe biſhops, and the epiſcopal clergy. I did not, however, imagine that theſe dangers were very near at hand in New-England; nor do ſo now, conſidering the ſmall proportion that epiſcopalians bear to proteſtants of other denominations. Should biſhops be ſent, and the Society bend its whole force to increaſe the church among us, it is not probable that theſe events would ſpeedily take place. But even remote evils may be reaſonably apprehended, as well as thoſe which are imminent; and are to be guarded againſt, as much as may be. That appointing biſhops for America, would be a probable means of increaſing the epiſcopal party here, will not be denied. This is doubtleſs one principal reaſon, why it is ſo much deſired; tho' neither this gentleman, nor the Society, ſo far as I can at preſent recollect, has particularly mentioned it. There is however, ſomething which looks a little this way in the *Abſtract* before-cited, wherein the reaſons for biſhops here are enumerated; one of which is, 'to confirm *new converts* from '*ſchiſm* *.' But even ſuppoſing a majority of epiſcopalians in the legiſlative body, in any [*I muſt not ſay* either, *becauſe there are more than* two] of theſe colonies, the gentleman aſks, 'Why 'ſhould a teſt law follow? Is there any ſuch law 'in the epiſcopal colonies? Or even though there 'were, can it be imagined, that if a prevailing 'party in New-England were wild enough to propoſe,

* *Abſtract*, 1715. p. 54.

'propoſe, his Majeſty, would ever be adviſed to 'paſs one for that purpoſe * ?' Whether there is any ſuch law already in any of the epiſcopal colonies, is with me a doubt. But by what I have obſerved of the over-bearing ſpirit of epiſcopalians *among us*, it is ſtrange to me if there is not. The very *Candid Examiner* of my *Obſervations*, plainly enough intimated his deſire of ſuch a law here. And if there were a conſiderable majority of epiſcopalians in the legiſlature, with a zealous, not to ſay *bigotted* and *oppreſſive* epiſcopalian Governour at their head, and biſhops in theſe parts to countenance and forward ſo *pious* a ſcheme for edifying the church; I make no doubt, but that the church of England would ſoon be eſtabliſhed here by a provincial law, and a teſt-act ſpeedily paſſed. Nor am I able to ſee any ground for the gentleman's great confidence, that the King would not be adviſed to allow that teſt; ſeeing there is ſuch a one in our mother-country. I preſume, the gentleman could aſſign no ſolid reaſon for a teſt-law in England, by which *proteſtant* diſſenters are excluded from offices there, which would not hold good in favour of a law of the ſame tenor here; I mean on the ſuppoſition of ſuch an increaſe and majority of the epiſcopal party. Can what is ſuppoſed reaſonable and equitable in Old England, be ſuppoſed unreaſonable and injurious in New? Or is it to be imagined, that the Head of the church of England would, at the deſire of the legiſlative body in any of his colonies, refuſe to allow of laws for eſtabliſhing that church therein, and for introducing a teſt? laws manifeſtly adapted to the worldly grandeur, if not to the ſpiritual good of that church, which is as it were *his body*; and

* P. 63.

and to bring in, if not to *convince* ſchiſmatics? If the gentleman was able, I could wiſh he had done ſomething more toward removing our apprehenſions in this reſpect, than to treat them with ſcorn; which is not the moſt likely method to convince thoſe that think calmly of the matter.

He treats as ſtill more wild and chimerical, the ſuppoſition of our ever being taxed in common, for the ſupport of biſhops and their clergy. Says he, 'The terror of being taxed for biſhops, &c.— 'is yet *more chimerical* than the former*.' But in caſe of ſuch an increaſe of the epiſcopal party, of the government's coming into their hands, and of the church of England's being here eſtabliſhed by a provincial law, which things muſt be preſuppoſed; where is the abſurdity of ſuch an apprehenſion? I can ſee none, except it lies in the *injurious* and *oppreſſive* nature of ſuch a ſuppoſed tax: But this conſideration will never prevent the doubts and fears of thoſe, who reflect on what has been done in almoſt every age and country in chriſtendom, by the prevailing religious party, for their own eaſe, and the further weakening and vexing the minority. The gentleman obſerves, that 'tithes are paid in England to the clergy by virtue 'of grants, which laid that burthen upon eſtates 'many ages before the preſent poſſeſſors enjoyed 'them †.' i. e. in the days of popery. He alſo expreſſes himſelf very poſitively, that if this had not been done, an act of parliament could not now be obtained, *of this or the like nature*, by which *diſſenters* in common with others, ſhould be taxed for the maintenance of the hierarchy. And having, for ought I can ſee, merely by his *peremptorineſs*, compleated

* P. 63. † Ibid.

pleated his victory in this respect, he immediately begins his triumph, by saying: 'With what *modesty* then can the Doctor suggest, that such a 'thing might be feared in New-England *?' I am very glad if the governing part of the nation have so much moderation respecting protestant dissenters, that such an act could not now be obtained there; which might, as it appears to me, be justly looked on as a great hardship, or instance of oppression. It may naturally be supposed, this gentleman is of the same opinion: Why else could not an act of that nature be now obtained, if the hierarchy were not already provided for, by virtue of grants, when Popery was triumphant, which laid the *burthen* of tythes on estates? But I do not pretend to have a thorough understanding of the *doctrine* of tythes, as *professed* and *preached* in the church of England; never having made this any, much less a principal part of *my study*, however important an *article* it may be.

Be this matter as it may, while there is a law in force, which bears so hard on protestant dissenters, as the test does, I shall not easily be perswaded, that it would be impossible if the hierarchy was not already provided for, to obtain an act for that purpose, by which the burthen should be laid upon dissenters in common with others; which, in some respects, might be thought a less grievance than the other: Particularly as it would be much less *reproachful* and *ignominious* to them, to be only obliged to pay to the support of a clergy disapproved by them, than to be treated as if they did not merit the character, and were therefore unworthy to enjoy the privileges of British subjects; though

* P. 64.

it is well known, his Majesty, whom God preserve, *has none more loyal and faithful.*

But to return. If bishops are sent to America, they must be well supported; this is beyond doubt. By whom? or by what means? I suppose there is not yet a fund provided by legacies, near adequate to the support of one; it not being a *small matter*, that suffices such dignified and *apostolical* persons. The Society will probably think, this burthen should not lie upon them; as they are not able to support a sufficient number of missions among people, whose necessities are great and urgent. Is it likely then, that the British nation, so deeply plunged in debt, and in which there is scarce a possibility of laying any new taxes, will undertake to maintain bishops for America? No surely. Will the bishops and rich clergy in England do it *out of their abundance?* This is at least as improbable; especially since it is supposed, that many of them cannot, to this day, be intirely perswaded, but that it is rather *more blessed to* receive *than to* give. Will American bishops then, trust to the generosity of the people here; depending upon *providence* and *alms*, or, in other words, upon the good will of the Americans? Will they be content without *reaping* any other *carnal things* here, than what the people may judge an adequate recompence for the *spiritual things sown* by them; particularly, since bishops seldom *preach*, for *confirming weak brethren*, and for *those holy impressions* made by their *hands*, on *all manner of people susceptible thereof?* If this is all, or the principal part of what they receive, their maintenance will not probably half *satisfy* them; except perhaps at first, while wonderful effects are expected from their *blessing*, and the *benign influence of their function.*

function. Nor will they run the risque, unless they have more faith in God, and less love to the *world*, than most of their order have had, since *Constantine* the Great became a *nursing father* to the church, and the pious *maternal* council of *Nice* suckled her with the clear and pure, the uncorrupt and 'sincere milk' of *Homoöusianity*, that she might 'grow thereby.' Can there then be a more probable supposition than this; that in consequence of the episcopal party's increasing in these colonies, and becoming a majority in the legislatures, the church of England would be established by provincial laws, and the people in common taxed for the support of bishops and their clergy? Have we reason to think that, from brotherly affection and tenderness, for *schismaticks*, they would exempt them from bearing a part of this burthen? I wish there was not more reason to apprehend, that they would oblige non-conformists to bear a double proportion of it; not, to be sure, out of any enmity, but only as an instance of *wholesome severity*, and a probable means of bringing them into the bosom of the church, to their eternal salvation—However, if a law for an equal tax upon conformists and non-conformists were passed in any British colony, for the purpose aforesaid, there is scarce any room to doubt, but that it would be confirmed by the crown: The Head must take care for the good of the body, and all its members. Nay, if bishops were speedily to be sent to America, it seems not wholly improbable, from what we hear of the *unusual* tenor of some late parliamentary acts and bills, for raising money on the poor colonies *without their consent*, that provision might be made for the support of these bishops, if not of all the church clergy also, in the *same way*.

The gentleman having endeavoured to expose to ridicule the aforesaid apprehensions, as perfectly *chimerical*, and called my *modesty* as well as understanding in question, even for hinting them, immediately adds, 'Besides, would it have been a 'good reason at the *revolution*, for debaring the 'dissenters from the full exercise of their church 'government and worship, that if they obtained it, 'they might perhaps increase till they got a *major* 'vote in both houses, and then enact no mortal 'knows what?' These cases, it is conceived, are much too dissimilar to argue thus from one to the other. The church of England had an exclusive legal establishment, at the time spoken of; the King for her Head, and sworn Protector, and almost all persons of interest and power for her members. Conformity was almost, if not the only path to preferment, civil honours, offices and emoluments. In short, the constitution both in church and state was so secured, so guarded both by laws and members, and non-conformists were so few, and under such disadvantages, that there was not room for any fear that they would ever increase so as to become the major and leading part in parliament, or be able, if they desired it, to over-turn the establishment, and oppress episcopalians. Apprehensions of this sort, would indeed have been perfectly *chimerical* at that time; especially considering the disunion of non-conformists among themselves, and the moral impossibility of their uniting, in establishing any other particular form of church government. What parity? what similitude is there between the circumstances of New-England and Old, in these respects? The cases are so widely different, that it is strange a gentleman

? P. 64.

gentleman of ſo much penetration and acumen ſhould, by his manner of reaſoning, ſuppoſe them parallel. We have no *ſuch* eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, as that of England; and, I hope, never ſhall. Our churches have no royal Head and Protector, in the ſenſe which that has;—only ONE *in heaven*, whom we pray to be the *Protector* of the other. We are not an independent people, or ſovereign ſtate, but dependent on England, wherein epiſcopacy is eſtabliſhed, and which we honor and obey, as our mother-country. Our Governor and all provincial Governors appointed by the crown, I ſuppoſe are, and by law muſt be, conformiſts to the church of England. A conſiderable number of perſons, even in the N. England colonies, are perſons of much wealth, influence and power. In moſt of the colonies the reſpective Governors have all military offices at their free diſpoſal, and the nomination to civil; and in ſome, a negative on the choice of counſellors. They muſt alſo be ſuppoſed, as a thing of courſe, moſt to favour epiſcopalians; ſo that conformity, inſtead of being a bar to preferment here, is perhaps generally found the readieſt way to it. Epiſcopalians may be, and often are, choſen members of both houſes of aſſembly in the colonies of New-England; nor is there either law, or any thing elſe, to prevent this, if, by their qualifications and good behaviour, they can recommend themſelves to the electors. And I hope this gentleman would not have the people *obliged* by law to chuſe them, whether they approve of them or not; though this ſeems to be the amount of what he ſomewhere ſays. Beſides, the epiſcopalians here are more united among themſelves than we are, being of different ſects and parties. And ſhould they [the epiſcopalians] hereafter approach any thing

thing near to an equality with us in point of number, they will have the advantage greatly in this reſpect; ſince they may more eaſily unite their ſtrength, in purſuing meaſures for their ſeparate advantage, and to *our* common detriment, than we ſhall ours, in any particular methods of oppoſition to them: So that they may carry their points, even with *inferior* numbers; eſpecially being moſt favoured by an epiſcopal Governor, whoſe influence is ordinarily very great *out of court*, as well as his proper conſtitutional power *in it*.

Our circumſtances being ſuch, is there not a hundred, a thouſand times, more reaſon to apprehend that epiſcopalians may in time become the major and governing party here, and enact ſuch laws as I have been ſpeaking of, than there was at the *revolution*, that the non-conformiſts in England might do the like there? I can hardly think that the gentleman, upon a little reflection, will diſown it. Which being the caſe, the grand principal on which he ſets out, in ſpeaking of American biſhops, is not applicable to the ſtate of theſe colonies; at leaſt, not by far, very far, ſo applicable as it was and is to that of England. The principle I intend, is this: That 'all members of every 'church are, according to the principles of liberty, 'intitled to *every part* of what they conceive to be 'the benefits of it, intire and compleat, *ſo far as* '*conſiſts with the welfare of civil government**.' It is readily owned, that our apprehenſion of what may poſſibly or probably be the conſequence of biſhops being ſent hither, ought not to put us on infringing the *religious liberty* of our fellow ſubjects, and *chriſtian brethren*, if they will pardon this

* P. 59.

this freedom: Neither have we any power to do so, if we were unreasonable and wicked enough to to desire it; *our charter* granting such liberty to *all protestants*. But the episcopalians here may enjoy this liberty, as they now do, without bishops in America, though under some inconveniences; principally perhaps, for want of *holy impressions* made by their *hands* in the ceremony of confirmation; their *lack* of which it must be owned, is sometimes but too visible in their *behaviour*. We are therefore, methinks, very excusable, if we express a *reluctance* at the proposal of a scheme, which we really apprehend may bring great trouble and temporal inconveniences upon us; and be the source of much division, discord and confusion: Especially, if it be also a scheme tending to promote that particular mode or profession of christianity among us, which we cannot but think, on the whole, much less conformable to the gospel, and therefore less conducive to the eternal happiness of mankind, than that which at present generally prevails among us.

But one thing mentioned by this gentleman, in order to reconcile us to this scheme, had almost escaped me. It is this. '*Popish bishops* reside *here*,' says he, 'and go about to exercise *every part* of their function, without offence and without observation *.' But this has a much less tendency to reconcile us to the proposal about American bishops, than to give us an alarm for the welfare of our mother country; with which, we are very sensible, our own is connected. If popish bishops exercise their function in England *without observation*, as the gentleman says, it is not indeed strange, if they do

* P. 66.

do it also *without offence*. But I cannot readily comprehend what he means by saying, that they do this *without observation*, when at the same time he speaks of it as a notorious fact: Though his meaning cannot be mistaken, when he says, this is done *without offence*. It must be, that it gives no considerable umbrage or jealouly, but that the people, at least *those of higher rank*, are contented it should be so. For he speaks of this as an instance and proof of the mutual candor, forbearance and moderation, which prevail at this day in England, among christians of different denominations; and so, as a reason why we should be well satisfyed with having bishops of the church of England in these parts. But if this proves any thing, it proves too much; *viz.* that we should be content to see, not only English, but Popish bishops, freely exercising their functions among us; the latter of which is not agreeable to our charter and laws. And though I am a warm friend to religious liberty in the largest sense; and tho' mutual forbearance cannot be too much recommended, where the differences are *merely* of a *religious* nature, or such as do not affect the liberty, safety and natural rights of mankind; yet I must own, I hope never to see popish bishops thus going about *without offence*, in New-England; being perswaded, from the very nature of divers popish tenets, that roman catholics cannot be *safely* tolerated in the free exercise of their religion, in a protestant government.

I HAVE freely explained myself as to the proposition concerning bishops in America; and though not so fully, yet more particularly than I intended to do; having been almost compelled to it, at once by this gentleman's formal attack upon

a

a few expressions, which occasionally dropped from my pen, and by his great courtesy in attempting to propose my objections *distinctly for me*, because he thought I was *a great deal too vehement* to do it myself. By what has now been said, he may perceive, at least that he has not wholly dissipated 'the poor man's fears *,' either by his reasoning or rallying on the subject. I have attended to his serious request, at the conclusion of his Argument--'if he is *still dissatisfied*, I intreat him to consider, 'for all men ought, *what manner of spirit he is* 'of†.' STILL DISSATISFIED I am; and, I hope, from such a *spirit* as he will not wholly disapprove, however wrong he may think my *opinions*:—from a love to *truth*, cultivated in my early days; from a love to what I take to be the *most primitive christianity*; from a sincere concern for the *welfare of my country*; and an apprehension that this scheme of bishops, if put in execution, will be greatly *detrimental* to it, both in *civil* and *religious* respects. This, I think, is the *spirit*, from which my *dissatisfaction* chiefly arises. The gentleman has doubtless well considered, from *what spirit it is*, that he is *so much set upon this scheme of bishops*; and it would be very uncharitable in me, to conclude it a *bad one*; as I do not, whatever I may think of the scheme itself. However, I think it but justice to him to acknowledge, that if such a scheme as he has proposed were to be put in execution, and *only* such consequences were to follow, as he *professedly* has in view, as the ends aimed at, I could not object against it; except only upon the same principle, that I object against the church of England *in general*, and should be sorry, from a regard to what I suppose a more scriptural way of worship,

* P. 64. † P. 67.

to ſee that church prevail here: Which yet, I ſolemnly declare, I would not prevent, though it were abſolutely in my own power, by any methods inconſiſtent with that full, entire liberty in religious matters, which I deſire for myſelf; and which all men, whoſe principles or practices are not inconſiſtent with the ſafety of Society, have a right to enjoy. Thus far I have the honor fully to agree with this gentleman". Thus Dr. Mayhew.

It is evident, by this time, that "objections can be offered againſt ſuch a plan" as has been propoſed. Whether the Dr. or thoſe who employed him to write, will eſteem them "reaſonable", time may diſcover. We have this opinion of them; and are perſuaded, that no "management", however "artful and dexterous", will be ſufficient to make them appear otherwiſe to thoſe, who will judge impartially.

Had the Dr. after he had opened the plan for the intended Epiſcopate, pointed out particularly it's reaſonableneſs in itſelf, it's conſiſtency with the eſtabliſhment at home, and the RIGHT Epiſcopalians have to ſuch a conſtitution in the Colonies, he had done ſomething to good purpoſe; but, inſtead of this, he appears in the guiſe of a confeſſor, and gravely aſks, "what reaſonable objections can be offered againſt ſuch a plan as this, ſo univerſally harmleſs in every reſpect?—Can any thing be promoted by it, but the good of the Church? Can any thing be objected againſt it, but that this will be prevented? Will any dare, in this age of Britiſh freedom, to avow the objection? Would not ſuch a bare-fac'd attempt, thus wantonly to oppreſs us, and prevent our enjoyment of thoſe invaluable rights to which we are equally entitled with others,—

thers,—rouſe the indignation of all the friends of religious liberty, whether Church-men, or Diſſenters" ? What could the Dr. aim at by theſe expoſtulatory queries, unleſs to work upon the paſſions of the vulgar ? Surely, he could not imagine, that any man of good underſtanding would be otherwiſe moved by them, than to wonder he ſhould only harangue, when it was his buſineſs to argue.

He goes on with placing again before our view the bugbear of perſecution. If they cannot have an Epiſcopate, they are puniſhed ; and to be puniſhed for their religious principles is perſecution in the ſtricteſt ſenſe. Says he, " will it be ſaid, that the prevention of an Epiſcopate in America is no puniſhment ? It may as well be ſaid, that keeping a man out of HIS RIGHT is no injuſtice". The Coloniſts then, who worſhip God according to the mode of the Church of England, have a RIGHT to an Epiſcopate ; and to prevent their enjoyment of this " invaluable right" is to puniſh them, and thus to puniſh them is, in " the propereſt ſenſe", to perſecute them. Let me make a pauſe here, and aſk, on what do they found this pretended RIGHT ? How came they by it ? Should it be ſaid, we claim liberty of conſcience, and fully enjoy it. And why would we confine this privelege to ourſelves ? Is it not as reaſonable, Epiſcopalians ſhould both claim and enjoy it ? It is readily allowed ; and we are as willing they ſhould poſſeſs and exerciſe religious liberty in it's full extent, as we deſire to do it ourſelves. But then, let it be heedfully minded, we claim no RIGHT to deſire the interpoſition of the STATE to ESTABLISH that mode of worſhip, government, or diſcipline, we apprehend

is moſt agreable to the mind of Chriſt. We deſire no other liberty, than to be left unreſtrained in the exerciſe of our religious principles, in ſo far as we are good members of ſociety. And we are perfectly willing Epiſcopalians ſhould enjoy this liberty to the full. If they think Biſhops, in their appropriated ſenſe, were conſtituted by Chriſt, or his apoſtles, we object not a word againſt their having as many of them as they pleaſe, if they will be content to have them with authority ALTOGETHER derived from Chriſt. But they both claim and deſire, a great deal more. They want to be diſtinguiſhed by having Biſhops upon the footing of a STATE-ESTABLISHMENT. Was this a RIGHT the apoſtles claimed, or any of their ſucceſſors in the uncorrupt ages of the Church? Is this a right that Chriſt has veſted in any profeſſors of his religion, much leſs in ſome, as contra-diſtinguiſhed from others? If Epiſcopalians have a RIGHT to a civil-eſtabliſhment in their favor, the other denominations in the Colonies have, in TRUE REASON, as good a right; and may, with as much juſtice, complain of perſecution, if it is not granted to them. The plain truth is, by the Goſpel-charter all profeſſed chriſtians are veſted with preciſely the ſame rights; nor has one denomination any more a right to the interpoſition of the civil magiſtrate, in their favor, than another; and wherever this difference takes place, it is beſide the rule of SCRIPTURE, and, I may ſay alſo, the genuine dictates of UNCORRUPTED REASON. If Epiſcopalians would reſt ſatisfied, as the other denominations do, with what they apprehend to be PURELY SCRIPTURAL miniſters, they would be perfectly upon a par with them, as to the enjoyment of religious liberty in it's fulleſt extent; But, if they muſt have what they

they call theſe ſcriptural miniſters upon a STATE-ESTABLISHMENT, they can have no reaſon to complain, unleſs of themſelves, if they do not enjoy that liberty which others do; not becauſe they are more favored or diſtinguiſhed, but becauſe they claim no other religious liberty, than what is granted in the Goſpel-charter. The ſhort of the matter is, if the Epiſcopalians in the Colonies are perſecuted, while they cannot obtain ſuch an Epiſcopate as they deſire, their own deſires are their ONLY perſecutors; unleſs they will ſay they are perſecuted by the KING, or PARLIAMENT, or BOTH, to whom ſolely it belongs to give them what they deſire: And if they ſhould not be pleaſed to do this, it may be juſtly "doubted", as they are certainly "armed with power", whether they would be "diſpoſed to bring them to the ſtake, or gibbet".

IF it is the truth of fact, that the late Dr. Samuel Chandler "gave his conſent to, and approbation of, American Biſhops, in the manner they have been requeſted", we very much wonder at it; and can no otherwiſe account for it than by ſuppoſing, that he was either too complaiſant to ſome high dignitary of the Church, or did not ſo carefully attend to the true merits of the caſe as he would have done, had he himſelf, or the diſſenters at home, been more immediately concerned in it.

WHO thoſe "ſome" are "that would freely join with the Epiſcopalians in their application for Biſhops, if their aſſiſtance was needed, we know not; but we know of numbers of the Church of England, of good ſenſe and great integrity, who are as truly hearty, as any among us, in their wiſhes, that they may

may never ſee Biſhops in America ; as firmly believing it would be a diſſervice, inſtead of advantage, to the intereſt of religion, conſidering the circumſtances of the Colonies.

The Dr. has nothing farther to ſay, in this ſection, but to tell us how, " by caſting his eyes, while writing, upon the public paper of the day, he was ſtruck with a paragraph, ſaid to be an anſwer from the King of Poland, to the Empreſs of Ruſſia", and by making ſome remarks upon it. But we are unable, notwithſtanding what he has offered, to perceive it's pertinency to the preſent diſpute. We find no fault with the King of Poland for " binding himſelf by oath to maintain and defend the popiſh religion, as it was the religion of thoſe with whom it lay to make him King ; but we think, at the ſame time, he was highly blamable, ſhould it be ſuppoſed he really believed this to be the true religion, to promiſe upon oath, that, inſtead of defending, he would perſecute thoſe in the Kingdom who were proteſtants by principle. Far from applauding his conduct, we have no other opinion of him, in conſequence of it, than of Saul, who, under the falſe perſuaſion of doing God good ſervice, madly perſecuted the diſciples of Chriſt. And the beſt excuſe that can be made for him is that, which this Saul, when he came to himſelf, made in his own behalf, namely, " that he did it ignorantly" ; notwithſtanding which, he calls himſelf " the chief of ſinners", for his former folly. We do not believe, that the King of Poland, or any other King on the earth, has a right, either from his oath, or any other way, to perſecute his ſubjects for their religious principles : On the contrary, we are fully perſuaded, that

that he ought, ſo far as the ſafety of the Government will allow of it, to protect them all, without diſcrimination, in that way of worſhipping God, they think will be moſt acceptable to him. We deſire no favor in this kind, in diſtinction from the Epiſcopalians; neither ought they to deſire any in diſtinction from us. If they have a right, upon the foot of *ſcripture* or *reaſon*, to deſire Biſhops upon a STATE-ESTABLISHMENT in order to the exerciſe of their religious principles, we have as good a right to deſire Paſtors, in the ſame way, for the exerciſe of our's; but as we do not deſire this for ourſelves, they cannot reaſonably complain if we do not deſire it for them.

ANSWER

ANSWER to SECTION IX. which pretends that the Epiſcopate propoſed cannot hurt the Diſſenters, and is free from all reaſonable Objections.

THE Dr. begins this ſection with ſaying; "ſhould it be pretended, that an American Epiſcopate would be productive of much clamor and diſcontent in the Colonies, it would be an ill-grounded aſſertion". We are of a quite different mind; as knowing it would be the occaſion of great uneaſineſs to multitudes. But ſays the Dr. arguing upon the ſuppoſition that it would be productive of diſcontent, "why the uneaſineſs of the members of the Church, *ſo juſtly founded*, deſerves not to be conſidered as much as the uneaſineſs of it's enemies, *without any foundation*, will be difficult to ſhew". It would be difficult upon his repreſentation of the caſe. But, by only reverſing it, and hereby exhibiting it's true ſtate, the difficulty at once vaniſhes Epiſcopalians, as we judge, have no right, in virtue of the Goſpel-charter, or any other, to a STATE-ESTABLISHMENT of Epiſcopacy in the Colonies; and if they are uneaſie for want of it, their uneaſineſs is "without any juſt foundation": Whereas, if they are diſtinguiſhed

diſtinguiſhed from the other denominations, by the grant of ſuch an eſtabliſhment, theſe denominations would have "juſt reaſon" for uneaſineſs on account of this diſcriminating difference.—The ſuggeſtion that follows, namely, "that diſcontent in the minds of Church-men would not have that dangerous tendency with reſpect to the government, which there is reaſon to apprehend of it in the minds of others", is at once baſe and unjuſt. If he does not know it, we do, that there have been in the boſom of the Church of England, in this Country, red hot Jacobites, who would gladly have overthrown the preſent eſtabliſhment of the Crown, had it been in their power; and if there are any ſuch Jacobites in the Colonies at preſent, they belong to that denomination only in whoſe "minds there is no dangerous diſcontent", unleſs it be ſuppoſed there may be ſuch among the Roman-catholics.

The Dr. having offered theſe few hints, upon ſuppoſition that the miſſion of Biſhops would be attended with diſcontent, now goes on to ſay, "of any conſiderable diſcontent or uneaſineſs, there is no reaſon to be apprehenſive". And why? It follows, "diſſenters in this Country have, of late years, greatly come off from their prejudices; and ſentiments of candor and moderation have viſibly taken place. And, excepting here and there a hot-heated writer—we would hope of the diſſenters in America, that they bear no ill-will to the Church, and deſire nothing more than ſecurity in the enjoyment of their preſent advantages". How does this agree with a paſſage, in the petition, which was ſent to the Univerſity of Cambridge, by the Dr. and the convened body who put him upon

writing ? In this petition, ſpeaking of " the diſſenters of all denominations", they ſay, " ſuch is the UNEASINESS not to ſay PERVERSENESS of their diſpoſition, that they are not contented quietly to partake theſe immenſe privileges, but make it their CONSTANT PRACTICE to TRADUCE and VILIFIE the CHURCH, not even refraining from the STATE under which ſuch immunities are allowed them". It is not poſſible there ſhould have been this moſt apparent inconſiſtency between their *appeal* and *petition*, if they had both been wrote under the influence of " ſimplicity and godly ſincerity", without the mixture of " worldly wiſdom". Infallibly, the account in the *appeal* is wrong, if that in the *petition* is right, and vice-verſa ; for they directly contradict each other.

THE Dr. goes on, " as to other denominations, the ſubject has been propoſed to ſome of the moſt ſenſible of them, who have, with great candor, confeſſed, that, as ſuch an Epiſcopate as has been requeſted, could have no ill effect upon any, they had no objections to offer". We ſay, on the other hand, the miſſion of Biſhops, upon the propoſed plan, has been mentioned to Epiſcopalians ; and ſome of the moſt ſolid, judicious, and wiſe among them, have freely expreſſed their diſapprobation of the thing, conſidering the ſtate and circumſtances of the Colonies, and as freely declared their wiſhes it might not come into event.

IT is farther ſaid, to ſhew there could be no reaſon for diſcontent, that " the Engliſh Biſhops have, for a long courſe of years, exerciſed their authority with ſo much mildneſs, tenderneſs and moderation, as ſcarcely to have afforded an inſtance of reaſonable

able complaint, eſpecially to diſſenters". Their tenderneſs and moderation towards the Coloniſts, that are Non-epiſcopalians, has not of late been remarkably viſible, ſhould this have been the caſe in regard of diſſenters at home. Had they been thus mild, it would have been much to the advantage of the infidel-natives here. Many of them, by this time, would probably have been converted to the faith of Chriſt, in conſequence of the operation of that INCORPORATING-ACT, which, under their benign influence, as we believe, was rendered null and void; and for no other reaſon than this, that the work of goſpeliſing the Indians would not be carried on after the mode of the Church of England, unleſs Epiſcopalians had a hand in it. To the ſame mildneſs and tenderneſs it was owing, that the petition of the Preſbyterian Church at New-York for a charter from the King met with the like fate. The account, as tranſmitted from a Gentleman in that City, is this. "The Church "(Preſbyterian) of New-York lately petitioned the "King for a Charter. On the 26th of Auguſt it "was rejected. The ghoſtly father of London "turned ſollicitor for the Bigots here, at the board "of trade. It was ſuggeſted, that the grant of "this favor would be a breach of the Coronation "oath. The trade would not decide upon that "argument; but report d, that general policy "was againſt our having greater privileges, than "are allowed by the laws of toleration. We were "very moderate in our requeſt. It was only to "ſecure our Church from falling into ſecular uſes, "and preſerve the bones and graves of our fathers "from being ſold. How hard! When Vintners, "Sadlers, Taylors, &c. &c. &c. are incorporated "Companies in London for leſs honorable ends!

"Is this the moderation of the Hierarchy"! If letters, from Epiſcopalians here of private character, and ſmall importance, could, by being handed to dignitaries at home, avail to ſuch hurtful purpoſes, what might reaſonably be expected as the effect of letters from a Biſhop in the Colonies!

As to the extract from Calvin, the Dr. muſt have inſerted it rather for the ſake of his name, which he knows is held in great veneration by many in the Country, than from his eſteeming him a friend to Epiſcopacy, in his ſenſe of it. He knows, or might eaſily have known, that he was no greater a friend to it than we are. He has indeed been often traduced, by Epiſcopal-writers, as one of the greateſt enemies of the Church of England. Says Dr. Nichols, beſides others I have not room to cite from, "Mr. Calvin, in his letters to ſome of his friends, made uſe of ſome very hard expreſſions with relation to the Church of England, which did not ſo well become the mouth of a divine". * The plain truth is, Calvin was in principle as real an enemy to the DIVINE right of Biſhops, as to the divine right of POPES.

THE Dr. goes on, "ſome formerly had an averſion to the idea of Biſhops in America, on the ſuppoſition that they muſt become ſubject to their authority." But the plan which is now fixed muſt effectually obviate all their objections, and diſſipate their fears". It has been largely ſhewn, that there are objections ſtill, and juſt ground for fear; and ſuch as Epiſcopalians will not find it very eaſie to remove. It is added, "our ordinations cannot hurt

* Defence of the Doct. and Diſcipline of the Church of England, pag. 16.

hurt them, any more than their ordinations can injure us:—And as to such discipline and government as is intended to be exercised under an Episcopate, they will have no reason to be dissatisfied therewith, any more than we now have to be dissatisfied with the discipline exercised by them". The Dr. quite mistakes the true ground of our dissatisfaction. It is not SIMPLY the exercise of any of their religious principles that would give the least uneasiness, nor yet the exercise of them under as many PURELY SCRIPTURAL Bishops as they could wish to have; but their having Bishops under a STATE-ESTABLISHMENT which would put them upon a different foot from the other denominations, and, without all doubt, sooner or later, expose them to many difficulties, and grievous hardships.

HE says farther, "we should have many reasons to be pleased with an Episcopate", and mentions two or three by way of specimen. "Sometimes we have been grieved at seeing the ill-behavior of a Clergyman in the orders of our Church; but, by the settlement of American Bishops, a remedy will be provided for this disorder". They have this remedy already provided at home; and yet, there are more disorderly Clergy-men *there* in proportion, than are to be found *here*. And, as this is certainly the truth of fact, it should seem better to let things remain as they are, than to run the venture of a remedy, which, upon long tryal, has been found not to answer it's intention. "Sometimes we have lamented, that the Bishops at home, and the Society for the propagation of the gospel, have been imposed upon by false accounts transmitted from hence by our American Clergy; but under an Episcopate, we must be sensible there can

can be no opportunity for any groſs impoſitions of this nature". There has been, and now is, opportunity for impoſitions in this kind at *home*, where there are Biſhops in plenty; and there would be much more opportunity for it *here*, as Biſhops in America would be ſo vaſtly diſtant from moſt of the Clergy under their care. It would be eaſier to impoſe upon them by wrong accounts *here*, than it is in England. "Sometimes again complaints have been made, that, in conſequence of this falſe information, miſſions have been erected in improper places, and the Society's bounty has been miſapplied; but of all ſuch caſes Biſhops in this Country will be competent judges, and no perverſion or abuſe of the Society's favors will be ſuffered to continue". It is not for want of good information, as to the real ſtate of religion in North-Carolina, that it has been ſo long, and ſo ſtrangely neglected by the Society; but from a prevailing diſpoſition to epiſcopize the more northern Colonies. And ſhould this be in the view of the Biſhops to be ſent, as many improper miſſions, in our eſtimation, might be erected, or encouraged, as there are now; probably a great many more. We are firmly perſuaded, this would rather hurt than mend the matter.

The Dr. concludes this ſection with removing, as he calls it, "the frightful objection of ſpiritual courts"; and he does it by telling us, "we may be ſure no ſuch courts will be erected". This is fully ſatisfying, ſo far as we may rely on his word. He ſeems to allow, that "ſome laws which relate to theſe courts may bear hard upon Britiſh liberty"; but ſays, "it is probable that theſe, and all other Eccleſiaſtical laws, as well as our liturgy and

and public offices, and our tranſlation of the Bible, will be reviewed as ſoon as it ſhall be thought, that there is good ſenſe and candor enough in the body of the nation to admit of it". When this happy day ſhall arrive, it will be time, and not before, as we judge, to think of an Epiſcopate in the Colonies.

The next ſection wholly relates to " the caſe of Tythes" ; which, as it has no immediate connection with the preſent ſubject, and would require a great deal of room thorowly to diſcuſs, I ſhall not trouble my ſelf, or readers, with ſaying any thing upon it ; but proceed to that which follows.

ANSWER

ANSWER to SECTION XI. entitled, farther Suſpicions and Objections obviated, and the Subject concluded.

THE firſt objection is thus expreſſed, "it may be inquired, whether new laws will not be made, in caſe of an American Epiſcopate, to ſubject us to the payment of tythes"? The Dr. anſwers, "of this there can be no more reaſon to be apprehenſive, than if Biſhops were not to be ſent hither". Very true, if the laws of England, relating to tythes, ſhould not be interpreted to bind in America, or no enacting claule ſhould be added to make them to be of force here: But of this there might be "reaſon to be apprehenſive", through the influence of Biſhops; eſpecially, if the ſupport of moſt of the Epiſcopal Clergy, in many of the Colonies, ſhould continue to depend on the charity of benefactors at home, as would probably be the caſe. This would afford a plauſible argument to ſubject the Colonies to the law of tythes; and no man living can ſay, they would not, in time, be thus ſubjected. Without all doubt, this law, or ſome other leſs offenſive in it's ſound, would take place here, as ſoon as the ſtate of things would allow of it. The Dr. himſelf has incautiouſly

ouſly dropt that, which naturally leads to ſuch a thought, under the next objection he mentions, which is ;

" As ignorance is ever ſuſpicious, it may be farther aſked, ſhall we not be taxed in this Country for the ſupport of Biſhops, if any ſhould be appointed" ? The Dr. anſwers in as peremptory terms, as if he had been endowed with abſolute foreſight. " Not at all". And yet, he immediately adds, " But ſhould a general tax be laid up- " on the COUNTRY, and thereby a ſum be raiſed " ſufficient for the purpoſe,—I believe ſuch a tax " would not amount to more than four pence on " one hundred pounds. And this would be no " mighty hardſhip upon the COUNTRY. He that " would think much of giving the ſix thouſandth " part of his income to any uſe, which the Legiſla- " ture of his Country ſhould aſſign, deſerves not " to be conſidered in the light of a good ſubject, " or member of ſociety". You here ſee, ye Coloniſts, the opinion of the Dr. and, we reaſonably preſume, of the Epiſcopal-Clergy under whoſe direction he wrote, that the COUNTRY might, in equity, be taxed for the ſupport of Biſhops ; that it would be " no mighty hardſhip", if it ſhould ; yea, that we ſhould not be worthy of the " character of good ſubjects, if we thought much of it". If the COUNTRY might be thus taxed, the tax might be laid upon thoſe Coloniſts whoſe forefathers forſook their native land, with all it's accommodations and comforts, that they might be freed from the Epiſcopal yoke of bondage And ſhall it be declared, in the face of the world, that this would be " no hardſhip" to their poſterity, and that they would be neither good ſubjects, or good

members of ſociety, if they "thought much" of ſupporting that power which has been, and may again be, terribly oppreſſive? Would this give no uneaſineſs? Would there be no reaſon for diſcontent? If the COUNTRY might be taxed four pence in one hundred pounds, it might, for the ſame reaſon, and with as much juſtice, if it was thought the ſupport of Biſhops called for it, be taxed four ſhillings, or four pounds in the hundred, and ſo on to ten pounds, until the tax of tythes was completely faſtened on us. Surely the Dr. was off his guard, or he would not have given us juſt reaſon to ſuſpect, inſtead of "ignorantly ſuſpecting", that we ſhould dearly pay for Biſhops, if they were ſent to America.

ANOTHER objection is, "that if Biſhops are ſettled in America, although in the manner we now propoſe, there will poſſibly be an augmentation of their power, as ſoon as circumſtances will admit of it". But, ſays the Dr. "at this rate there can "be no end of objecting. For if every poſſible ill "effect of a thing, proper in itſelf, and harmleſs "in it's tendency, may be made an argument a-"gainſt it, there is nothing that can eſcape. Ar-"guments of this ſort may as fairly be alleged a-"gainſt a religious toleration,—againſt allowing the "common people the uſe of the holy ſcripture, or "the liberty of examining any points of religion "or government, &c; for none can tell what ill "conſequences and abuſes may follow, in ſome "future period, from theſe conceſſions and indul-"gences". Enough, I truſt, has been already ſaid to ſhew, that the propoſed Epiſcopate is neither "proper in itſelf", or harmleſs in it's tendency"; and the objected "augmentation of power", far from

from being MERELY POSSIBLE, is in an high degree probable. Would Biſhops here be contented with "reſtrained powers" longer than they could help it? Would they not endeavour, as they had opportunity, and circumſtances would permit, to regain thoſe appendages they have been deprived of? Would they be eaſie until they were upon an equal footing with their brethren of the ſame rank and order at home? Are theſe ONLY poſſibilities? May they not rather be expected in the natural courſe of things? Nay, the Dr. himſelf has unwarily opened the workings of his own heart upon this head. Says he, "ſhould the government ſee fit "hereafter to inveſt them [Biſhops] with ſome de-"gree of civil power, worthy of their acceptance, "which it is impoſſible to ſay they will not;—yet "it is inconceivable, that any would thereby be "injured". We are not told, what degree of civil power would be worthy of a Biſhop's acceptance; but, if we may gueſs by what is thought worthy at home, it cannot well be ſuppoſed to be any thing ſhort of the ſuper-intendency of two or three American-governments. It may eaſily be conceived, wherein this might be "injurious", at leaſt, to ſome. And, as civil power, in every degree, has in fact been exerciſed, by ſome or other, in an oppreſſive arbitrary manner, we are even neceſſitated not to be at a loſs to conceive, how this might be the caſe, was this kind of power, in whatever degree, veſted in Biſhops. The Dr. indeed ſays, "it is hoped, that our Biſhops will ALWAYS be thought to deſerve the character of being poſſeſſed of the greateſt ability, integrity, and prudence"; which is "all that the happineſs and ſafety of the Public require". But on what does he found this hope? Neither Biſhops, nor any other men in dignity and

power, have ALWAYS been remarkable for ſuperior ability, or integrity, or prudence. This is too much to be expected in ſuch a world as our's. It has never yet been the caſe in any age, or place. And ſhould it happen, in time to come, that Biſhops here ſhould be not only wanting in theſe good qualities, but poſſeſſed of the contrary ones, would it be at all difficult to conceive wherein they might be injurious? But ſuppoſing the beſt, that they were ALWAYS the men that have been deſcribed, would it be no hurt to the Church of Chriſt, ſhould there be conjoined with their ſpiritual powers, thoſe that are of a worldly nature? Would this be no injury to the ſpecial objects of their care, as God's miniſters in his kingdom that is not of this world? Timothy was, in the Dr's opinion, a Biſhop of the higheſt order in the Church; and what were the ſentiments of the inſpired Paul, relative to his proper work as ſuch? Says he to him, * "Thou therefore endure hardneſs as a good ſoldier of Jeſus Chriſt. No man that warreth entangleth himſelf with the AFFAIRS OF THIS LIFE". And again, † "Meditate on theſe things, give thy ſelf WHOLLY to them, that thy profiting may appear to all". There is, in the nature of the thing, an incongruity in veſting the ſame perſons with ſpiritual and civil powers. It unavoidably tends to divide their minds, as well as labors; and is much more adapted to do hurt, than good. Biſhop Latimer, one of the firſt reformers, and a bleſſed Martyr for the ſake of Chriſt, has expreſſed his ſentiments upon this head very juſtly and ſtrikingly, in his ſermon of the plough; which I recommend to the Dr's peruſal.

I HAVE

* 2 Tim. 2. 3. † 1 Tim. 4. 15.

I HAVE now taken notice of what he has reply'd to " all the objections", he ſays " have been made againſt ſending Biſhops to America, ſo far as has come to his knowledge" ; and I willingly leave it with the reader to judge, whether, inſtead of having proved them to be " unreaſonable and groundleſs", he has not, by what he has offered, added to their real ſtrength, rendering them more difficult to be juſtly anſwered. He ſeems to think it " poſſible other objections may be ſuggeſted" ; and herein he has judged right. Such objections have, in theſe papers, been placed before his view, not as " invented by dexterity, or ill-will", but as naturally and obviouſly ariſing from the true merits of the cauſe itſelf : Nor do we think they are capable of being refuted. " Cavilers and Sophiſts" may attempt their refutation, and, by the help of " legerdemain", they may poſſibly do it with ſome " appearance of plauſibility" to vulgar eyes ; but ſhould they " employ their talents in this exerciſe", though they might pleaſe themſelves, as children are diverted while " engaged in crambo or puſh-pin", they would neither " deſerve the public attention", or impoſe upon men of good underſtanding, and ſolid judgment.

THE Dr. concludes his ſubject with a few miſcellaneous thoughts, he may ſuppoſe of ſome weight. Says he, " unleſs Biſhops ſhould be ſpedily ſent, we can foreſee nothing but the *ruin* of the Church in this Country". So far as it is a STATE-CHURCH, there is no reaſon for concern about it's ruin. Wherein it is a Church having no officers, ſuperior or inferior, but PURELY SCRIPTURAL ones, and walking according to no rule but that which is of DIVINE appointment, it's " ruin" cannot

not be feared, but through want of faith in the ſuper-intending government of the great "Head over all things".—Says he, "the Church of England here is ſo eſſentially the ſame with the Church at home, that it muſt ever ſubſiſt or periſh by the ſame means". The Church of England at home, and here, may periſh in regard of a STATE-ESTABLISHMENT, and undoubtedly will, ſooner or later; but ſo far as it is a Church, built on the "foundation of the Apoſtles", Chriſt himſelf being "the chief corner-ſtone", it will "ſubſiſt" againſt all oppoſition of earth and hell.— Says he, "The Church here has been long ſtruggling under ſuch an increaſing load of difficulties, and is now in ſuch a ſtate of oppreſſion, as to deſerve the compaſſion of the whole chriſtian world". We are really aſtoniſhed at this hyperbolical repreſentation; and can no otherwiſe account for, or excuſe it, than by ſuppoſing that the Dr's zeal had, at this time, deprived him of all ſober judgment. — Says he, "the author need not uſe many words to prove, that conſiderations, even of a political nature, are ſufficient, in this caſe, to prevail with thoſe who are inſenſible to other motives". What he means here is, "that no form of Eccleſiaſtical government can ſo exactly harmoniſe with a *mixed* monarchy in the ſtate, as that of a *qualified* Epiſcopacy". But it ought to be remembered, the Dr's Biſhops, according to his own account of them, pag. 14, 15. are ABSOLUTE MONARCHS in the CHURCH; and SUCH muſt Kings be in the STATE to make out a proper analogy. Biſhops there have been, even in England, who, in their own imaginations, were ABSOLUTE MONARCHS in the CHURCH; and they would have made the King the ſame ABSOLUTE MONARCH in the STATE, to the deſtruction of that

wiſely

wiſely contrived mixture of power, which gives the Britiſh-ſtate-conſtitution the preference to any on the whole earth. The government of the Church, by the Dr's Biſhops, is more unlike the government of the ſtate, by King, Lords and Commons, than any form of government in the Church that was ever known in the Colonies; and, perhaps, is more naturally and powerfully adapted to ſubvert it.—Says he, in a word to thoſe who have been averſe to American Biſhops, "the ſubject is here placed in it's true light, and thereby, it is truſted, their miſapprehenſions are fairly removed, and conſequent fears are ſhewn to be groundleſs". As the Epiſcopate propoſed is not, in all reſpects, as we apprehended it might be, upon it's firſt appearance, ſo far our conceptions are rectified; but the Dr. is much miſtaken, if he thinks, that he has removed our fears. By what he has offered, eſpecially in anſwer to objections, inſtead of ſhewing that they are "groundleſs", he has really added ſtrength to the reaſons on which they were grounded. We are, from him, more ſatisfied than ever, that an Epiſcopate in the Colonies, upon the publiſhed plan, even in his view of it's operation, will be greatly hurtful. It ought not therefore to be expected, though we call ourſelves "friends of truth, juſtice and liberty", that we ſhould do any thing to help forward the miſſion of Biſhops.—Says he, on one ſuppoſition, in order to point out the "injuſtice and cruelty" of endeavouring to prevent the Epiſcopate aſked for, "If all the religious denominations in America, by the general conſtitution of the Britiſh Colonies, are to be treated on the footing of a perfect equality, for which ſome have contended; then the Church of England is as fully entitled to the compleat enjoyment

ment of it's own diſcipline and inſtitutions, as any other chriſtians". Who ever objected againſt this "compleat enjoyment", upon the footing of a "perfect equality"? The "other chriſtians" do not enjoy, nor do they deſire to enjoy, any religious liberty but that wherewith Chriſt, without diſcrimination, has made his diſciples free; and if this is not enjoyed by Epiſcopalians "as compleatly", as by the other denominations in the Colonies, it is becauſe they want to be upon an UNEQUAL FOOTING with their neighbours; that is, to have Biſhops that are more than MEER SCRIPTURAL ones, that ſhall exerciſe their authority under the patronage of a STATE-ESTABLISHMENT, whereby they would be diſtinguiſhed from, and ſet above, all the other denominations in America; which, as we are verily perſwaded, would be putting them into circumſtances, they have no right, either from nature or grace, reaſon or revelation, to expect or deſire. If they have ſuch right, let the grant of it, as made to them, be produced, that it's authenticity may be fairly examined in the view of the Public; if they have not, their complaints are unreaſonable.— Says he, in fine, on another ſuppoſition, "if any denomination is entitled to a ſuperiority above others, as is believed by many; then the claim of the Church of England to this preference is not to be diſputed". We diſpute it not in regard of Virginia and Maryland; but as to the Colonies northward of theſe, we think, the preference, in point of ſuperiority, if ſuch preference be at all ſuppoſed, ought, in common juſtice, to be given to them; not only as they are more than thirty times more numerous than the Epiſcopalians, but as they have merited diſtinguiſhing favor, ſo far as it may reaſonably be beſtowed, in virtue of the vaſt expence

of

of labor, treaſure and blood, their fore-fathers, in ſome of theſe Colonies, have been at, to extend the Britiſh Empire, and add to it's ſtrength, riches and glory.

HAVING thus largely conſidered the PLAN PROPOSED for an American Epiſcopate, and what has been offered in it's vindication, I ſhall not think it proper to conclude without firſt letting the Dr. and his friends who voted him their writer, know, that we give full credit to what they have declared, upon having mentioned their plan for an Epiſcopate, upon it's FIRST APPEARANCE, in the Colonies, namely, "this, without any reſervation, or equivocation, is the exact plan which has been ſettled at home; and the only one on which Biſhops have been requeſted here, either in our general or more particular addreſſes". But then, we would, at the ſame time, add, that we muſt be excuſed, if we ſay, we do not believe, they would ever have contrived, or propoſed, this plan, had it not been, as they imagined, a ſcheme for the introduction of Biſhops that would carry with it a plauſible ſhew, and give opportunity to keep that out of ſight which would occaſion univerſal uneaſineſs and diſcontent. We are neither ſo void of diſcernment, or unacquainted with the intrigues of thoſe who are moſt zealous for an American Epiſcopate, as not to be fully ſatisfied, they have much more in deſign than they have been pleaſed openly to declare. Their ultimate views, whatever they propoſe to begin with, have not been ſo perfectly ſecreted in their own breaſts, but that they have been whiſpered about from one friend to another, ſo that we are at no loſs to form a true judgment of them. The Dr. himſelf, though

he ſays, pag. 79. "they have carefully conſulted our ſafety and ſecurity, and ſtudied not to injure but oblige us", has yet very freely, however injudiciouſly, given us to underſtand, pag. 107. that "a tax", in conſequence of the miſſion of Biſhops upon this very plan, "may be laid upon the COUNTRY"; which, if it ſhould, "would be no mighty hardſhip", and ſhould we think it ſuch, we "ſhould not deſerve to be conſidered in the light of good ſubjects, or members of ſociety": Nay, he even ſuppoſes, notwithſtanding the expreſs guard againſt it in the plan, that Biſhops "may hereafter be inveſted with civil powers worthy of their acceptance", and is particular in his juſtification of it as reaſonable, pag. 110. Other things have tranſpired from thoſe, who did not know how, or were not able, to keep a ſecret. We are as fully perſuaded, as if they had openly ſaid it, that they have in view nothing ſhort of a COMPLETE CHURCH HIERARCHY after the pattern of that at home, with like officers in all their various degrees of dignity, with a like large revenue for their grand ſupport, and with the allowance of no other privilege to diſſenters but that of a bare toleration. * Such an Hierarchy may poſſibly, in time,

* The REASON, upon which the petition of the New-York-Preſbyterian-Church for a Charter to ſecure the bones of their deceaſed relatives and friends, was negatived at home, by the interpoſition of a right reverend Father in God, is an evident ſpecimen of this. And it was, without all doubt, for the SAME REASON that the incorporating-act, paſſed in this province, relative to the propagation of religion among the Indian-natives, was, in like manner, through Prelatical influence, rendered null and void. And if what we have heard is true, that a TWENTIETH PART, of the American

time, take place in the Colonies to the ſouth of Penſylvania; but there is no probability, humanly ſpeaking, that this ſhould be effected in the Colonies to the northward of it. Had it not been for the Society's pious charity, we ſhould not have ſeen, at this day, it may reaſonably be thought, more than half a ſcore Epiſcopal Churches in theſe ſeven Provinces; and, notwithſtanding the immenſe ſums of money they have expended in propagating the Church of England, it's numbers, within theſe bounds, are comparatively trifling; and they conſiſt, in great part, of thoſe too, who are no otherwiſe Epiſcopalians, than their being ſo tends to ſerve a preſent turn. The other denominations, from their firſt capacity of moral diſcernment, have been indoctrinated in that way of ſerving God that is peculiar to them. And will they eaſily give this up, and embrace the Epiſcopal mode of worſhip and diſcipline? "Hath a nation changed their gods which yet are no Gods"? If people, in pagan Countries, who have been taught by their anceſtors to worſhip Idols, which are vanity, inſtead of the living Jehovah, will not, without the utmoſt difficulty, be wrought upon to change the object of their devotion; why

American conquered lands, as they are and may be granted by the Crown to private perſons, or bodies of men, is and will be appropriated to the uſe and benefit of the Church of England in the Colonies, a foundation is laid, and laying for as great a Church-revenue as they have at home. Can it be ſuppoſed, that theſe planners have nothing in view, but what is perfectly "harmleſs to other denominations?" Are we not, even, neceſſitated to think, that the plan they have propoſed, is only a bait thrown out to catch the leſs thinking, and too credulous among the people?

ſhould it be thought, that the Coloniſts would renounce thoſe religious ſentiments and modes of expreſſing them, that were handed to them from their fathers, which, inſtead of being ridiculous and abſurd, are agreable to the dictates of uncorrupted reaſon, and the truth of revelation, and clearly perceived to be ſo? A ſtrange change muſt be effected in that temper of mind they have hitherto diſcovered, and that has, upon certain occaſions in providence, been greatly improved and ſtrengthened, if they ſhould be perſuaded, inſtead of enjoying the freedom of chriſtians, to take upon them that yoke of bondage, which their Progenitors threw off as too burdenſome and galling to bear! In vain may this be looked for. There is not the leaſt reaſonable room to hope for ſuch a thing; and it is really ſurpriſing, the Epiſcopalians are not convinced of it, after ſo long a tryal to ſo little purpoſe. It is our firm faith, truſting in God, that the principles of religious as well as civil liberty will ever diſtinguiſh theſe Colonies, and that goſpel worſhip and diſcipline, in their purity and ſimplicity, which was the great Errand of our fore fathers in coming over to this new world, will be upheld and maintained here, from generation to generation, until time ſhall be no more, whatever plans may be formed to the contrary, and whatever efforts may be made to carry them into execution.

I would now aſk pardon for being thus lengthy, and for being too often tediouſly ſo by meer repetitions. I have only to ſay in excuſe for my ſelf, that I was not willing to let any thing paſs, the Dr. or his friends, might think worthy of notice, and ſo worthy of it as to bring to view over

over and over again. If he had comprehended what he has offered to the Public in a few pages, as he might eaſily have done, and, as I imagine, greatly to the advantage of his cauſe, he would have ſaved me ſome trouble, and both our readers the tryal of much patience.

E R R A T A.

PAGE 12. laſt line read, vol. I. pag. 637, 638. p. 25. l. 7. r. ſome of thoſe. p. 28. l. 1. f. highneſs in ſome copies, r. holineſs. p. 30. l. 3. f. no r. ſo p. 32. l. 16. f. this government r. the government of the church. p. 32. l. 2. fr. bot. r. angels. p. 36. l. 6. r. angels. p. 64. l. 6. fr. bot. r. diſobedience. p. 65. l. 19. dele the. p. 82. l. 18. f. can r. cannot. p. 85. l. 9. r. perſuaſion. p. 87. l. 16. r. for inſtead of from. p. 91. l. 23. r. orders. p. 93. l. 6. fr. bot. r. trade. p. 97. laſt l. f. real r. intire. p. 138. l. 19. r. ROYAL, and l. 5. fr. bot. r. 1702. p. 150. l. 10. fr. bot. r. ſacraments.

To be had of THOMAS LEVERETT, at his Shop in Corn-Hill.

A Few of Dr. Chauncy's Diſcourſes at the Dudleian Lecture, at Harvard-College in Cambridge, on the Validity of Preſbyterian Ordination:—His Sermon on the Repeal of the Stamp-Act;—and, Remarks on the Biſhop of Landaff's Society-Sermon.—As alſo,—Henry on the Bible, 6 Vol. Doddridge's Family Expoſitor, 6 Vol. Burkett on the New-Teſtament, Puffendorff's Law of Nature and Nations, ditto his Introduction, 2 Vol. Rolt's Dictionary of Trade & Commerce, Flavel's Works, Hill's Britiſh Herbal, Hogarth's Analyſis, Seed's Sermons, 4 Vol. Roſſeau Emilius, Naval Trade and Commerce, 2 Vol. Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, 4 Vol. Spectator, 8 Vol. Howell's Hiſtory of the Bible, 3 Vol Drake's Anatomy, 3 Vol Quincy's Lexicon, ditto Diſpenſatory, Brook's Practice of Phyſic, 2 Vol. Huxham on Fevers, Wood's Inſtitutes, Burn's Juſtice, 3 Vol. Barne's Notes of Caſes, 2 Vol. Hiſtory of Common Law, Martin's and Graveſend's Philoſophy, Salmon's and Gordon's Geographical Grammar, Ainſworth's, Young's and Cole's Latin Dictionary, Johnſtons's, Bailey's and Dyche's Engliſh ditto, Paradiſe Loſt, Young's Night Thoughts, Thompſon's Seaſons, Caſes of Conſcience, 2 Vol. Viſitor, 2 Vol. Eloſia, 4 Vol. Tom Jones, 4 Vol. Roderick Random, 2 Vol Pamela, 4 Vol. Folio, Quarto, and other ſiz'd Bibles, School, and a Variety of other Books, &c. &c. &c.

APR 17 1952